

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. VII

DECEMBER, 1936

No. 12

The Training of Ministers.

"Why should Ministers Go to College?" Under this caption the Rev. Carl Hamilton Morgan of Philadelphia wrote an article in the September 17 issue of the *Watchman-Examiner*, a national Baptist weekly. In his introductory remarks he calls attention to the fact that before the Revolutionary War of nine universities found in the United States all but one were established for the express purpose of training men for the Christian ministry, that until very recent times the history of higher education in this country is largely the history of ministerial education, that the Bachelor of Arts degree was in most of the older colleges a theological degree, but that in the course of time the study of theology lost its place in the college program.

I.

The Rev. Mr. Morgan writes on the present situation in the training of ministers and speaks of it as being an unsatisfactory arrangement. He says: "The program of theological training now generally followed by candidates for the ministry in most of the Protestant denominations is four years of training in a college, usually in the liberal arts course, followed by three years of theological training in a denominational seminary. Briefly stated, this story is the story of hundreds of young men who enter college to prepare for the ministry:—

"First, they enter college full of enthusiasm for their chosen calling and find with quite some shock that they are almost alone in their choice of vocation. On all sides are eager young doctors, lawyers, teachers, psychologists, sociologists, business executives, and artists, but the 'theologs' are almost an extinct race.

"Second, these same young men soon learn that, while there is a pre-med, a pre-law, a normal, and a pre-business course of study, there is no specially prepared course for the minister. He must take the traditional 'arts' course, which in the great majority of colleges is in no way thought of as a preparatory course for ministers.

"Third, many colleges by their system of required majors make

it almost impossible for the young ministers to gain even an elemental knowledge of Greek or Hebrew and provide no more than the bare rudiments of English rhetoric and public speaking, and at the same time science courses — valuable without doubt — are emphasized out of all proportion to a minister's needs.

"Fourth and perhaps most dangerous to the young minister is the general attitude toward religion that pervades the average college. It is by no means true that the average college sets out to destroy the student's religion. Even the most agnostic of professors are usually too sportsmanlike to attempt deliberately to destroy a man's faith out of sheer vandalism. The attitude of the average college teacher is one of indifference toward religion rather than one of definite hostility. Other things are regarded as of greater importance; religion is relegated to the limbo of condemned superstitions. Such an atmosphere is hardly conducive to the growth of a strong faith. It is quite common to see a small, but ardent group of pretheological students dwindle until at graduation just one or two graduate with any intention of entering a seminary."

II.

What does Dr. Morgan propose? He writes: "The theological seminaries must ultimately assume the obligation of providing the future ministers with a *complete education*. This is no new concept, but one practised for centuries by the Roman Church, and no one will deny that priests from the Catholic seminaries of this country are prepared for their tasks as they view it. Furthermore, many Protestant seminaries have been playing with the idea in recent years and have established subseminary courses of varying lengths and degrees of completeness. Our attitude toward such experiments must change if we are to produce the race of strong ministers that Christianity so much needs. These courses must no longer be considered as a poor substitute for a four-year college training, but must be made so thorough and so much better suited to the young minister's needs that four years spent in an average college will be considered a poor substitute for this more specialized training. How long should such a course be? . . . I would recommend a course of six years' length above high school. In terms of semester hours such a course would normally consist of one hundred hours of general cultural background material and approximately ninety hours of specialized theological education."

III.

The plan which the writer whom we are quoting proposes would in his estimation have the following definite results in favor of better men and better trained men for the ministry: —

"1. A larger and more select group will enter the ministry. Many of the most promising boys in high school feel a call to the work of

the ministry; and if they could enter immediately upon such a course, there is little likelihood of their dropping by the wayside.

"2. The six-year exposure to the contagious Christian atmosphere of the theological seminary is more likely to produce an ardent ministry than the indifferent climate of the college.

"3. A better and more complete training can be given under such condition than can be given in college. . . .

"4. At least one year of formal training could be eliminated and the student sent out into the world at an earlier age and with less debt.

"5. With a longer training period at its disposal, the seminary will be able to guide its students through a practical internship in Christian service. In the early days of medical training it was generally understood that the young physician would gain his practical experience on his patients during the first five years of his practise. Any medical institution which sent out its graduates to-day with such a philosophy and necessity thrust upon them would be counted guilty of wilful murder. Has the seminary, dealing as it is with the precious souls of men, any more right to send forth men totally inexperienced in the practical application of Christianity to the real needs of the world?"

Finally Dr. Morgan calls attention to a seminary that is following his plan. He says: "The Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary has been carrying on such an experimental course for five years and can show that even with a five-year course — two years of college and three of seminary training — the graduates do just as well scholastically as the graduates of four-year colleges, are usually stronger preachers and better-equipped evangelists."

IV.

It was with great interest and satisfaction that we read Dr. Morgan's pronouncements. For almost a hundred years our own church-body has been doing almost exactly what Dr. Morgan proposes should be done. We have our preparatory schools, offering a four-year high-school course and a two-year college course, with a curriculum especially adapted to prepare our students for the study of theology at the theological seminary. At our preparatory schools we teach the usual high-school and college branches, and in addition to the study of English we teach German, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew; and, of course, throughout the entire six-year period our students are given instruction in the doctrines of the Christian religion. It is self-evident that under the circumstances we cannot give the same time and attention to *all* the branches of study that are ordinarily taught in high schools and junior colleges. Yet in addition to our heavy language course and our religious instruction our students are

given courses in algebra and geometry, chemistry, biology, and physics, mythology, ancient, medieval, and modern history, American government, modern culture, public speaking. Such studies as logic and psychology, which one might miss in the list just given, are taught at the Seminary. Our experience has been that our students have fared well, also scholastically, when compared with graduates of other colleges.

Dr. Morgan recommends a course of six years' length above the high school. In accordance with a resolution passed by our Synod a fourth year is to be added to our seminary course at St. Louis beginning in 1938, giving us the six-year course above the high school proposed by Dr. Morgan.

We have not only the *specialized* pretheological college curriculum for the training of our ministers, as proposed by Dr. Morgan, but also a specialized high-school curriculum for our ministerial students. Many years our preparatory schools were attended *almost exclusively* by students who had made the ministry their goal, and even to-day this is true as far as the large majority of our students is concerned.

What has been said gives us much food for thought. Of late years some among us have been deploring the fact that our students lack certain credits that the usual college graduate has. In order to make room for such courses in our curriculum, it has been suggested that we, for instance, cut down our Latin, perhaps also our Greek. Now, the point at issue is not whether we should improve our educational system for the training of ministers,—many of us are even now in favor of a four-year college course,—but whether our specialized course as we now have it serves our purpose well. We believe that it does. Getting away from that in order to conform our educational system to the usual high-school and college courses would, we are convinced, be a great mistake. Medical students and law students are required to take a specialized course preparing them for the medical college or the law school. Certainly the same requirement should be made of ministerial students. Also the fact that our specialized course has kept non-ministerial students from attending our institutions may, after all, not be something which ought to be much deplored.

After all has been said and done, we must admit, with due acknowledgment of the blessings given us by God, that our educational system for the training of ministers has given us able pastors and preachers, such as compare very favorably with the preachers of other denominations; also as far as scholarship is concerned, our graduates do not compare unfavorably with the average college graduate. Any improvement, therefore, of our educational system for the training of our ministers must not only be along the lines of general culture, but also distinctly along the lines of specialized training.

J. H. C. FRITZ.

Einige römische Gesetze im ersten Drittel des vierten Jahrhunderts.

Wenn der Schluß des vierten und der Anfang des fünften Jahrhunderts als die Zeit betrachtet werden, da das römische Heidentum unterging, vom Christentum überwunden wurde, so ist das nur dann wahr, wenn man unter „überwunden werden“ bloß dies versteht, daß es die Unterstützung der römischen Regierung, des römischen Staates oder auch nur dessen Duldung verlor. Heidnische Anschauungen, Gebräuche, Religionsübungen blieben weit verbreitet, behielten sogar in manchen Gegenden das Übergewicht im Volksinn, obwohl vielfach auf eine etwas höhere Stufe gehoben, oder, des gökendienerischen Inhalts entleert, zu synkretistischen Formeln und Zeremonien verbünnt. Es wird dabei nicht in erster Linie an die verunglückten Versuche eines Julian gedacht, sondern an Leute wie Senator Symmachus und seine Genossen, die bis zum letzten Atemzug für die Wiederaufstellung der Siegesgöttin im Senatshaus kämpften.*)

Ebenso mißverständlich ist der Ausdruck, seit dem Sieg an der Milvischen Brücke, 312, oder seit dem Edikt von Mailand, 313, habe Konstantin die Kirche zur Staatskirche oder ihre Religion zur Staatsreligion gemacht. Wir können uns denken, wie man zu diesem Mißverständnis gekommen ist. Man kennt die Erzählung von der Kreuzeserscheinung des Konstantin; man weiß, daß die Verfolgungen „seit der Zeit“ aufhörten; man weiß, daß Konstantin sich taufen ließ; man weiß, daß die kirchlichen Zustände sich von Jahr zu Jahr unter dem Einfluß günstiger Gesetzgebung besserten; man weiß, daß heidnische Tempel zerstört wurden und heidnische Priester ihre Vorrechte und sogar ihre Beschäftigung verloren. Da liegt es sehr nahe, alle diese Veränderungen auf ein und dieselbe Person und deren Gesetzgebung zurückzuführen. Dies besonders, wenn man überschwengliche Zeugnisse und Zeugen aus alter Zeit nicht kritisch beleuchtet, sondern vollständig überfieht, daß dies oder jenes nicht aus 350, sondern aus 560 stammt, daß dieser oder jener ein ausgesprochener Freund (oder Feind) des Kaisers oder der Kirche ist.

In den folgenden Zeilen soll, abgesehen von den Toleranzedikten aus dem Anfang des Jahrhunderts, nur auf die Gesetzgebung verwiesen werden, die im Codex Theodosianus aus den Jahren 313 bis 336 (dem Todesjahr Konstantins) vorliegt. Mit diesem Kodex hat es folgende Bewandnis. In der Geschichte des römischen Rechts war das vierte Jahrhundert epochemachend. Für die Gesetzgebung in der Zeit der Republik waren von großem Einfluß die „Antworten“ (responsae) der Juristen gewesen, die auf Gesetzesfragen öffentlicher Beamten gegeben wurden. Augustus hatte gewissen in kaiserlicher Gunst stehenden

*) Er starb im fünften Jahrhundert, 405.

Juristen das Recht gegeben (*ius respondendi*), solche Entscheidungen als bindende abzufassen. Die bestehenden Gerichtshöfe waren auch unter kaiserliche Autorität gebracht, und gegen das Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts fing kaiserliche Gesetzgebung an, die Juristenentscheidungen als höchste Rechtsquelle zu verdrängen. Gesetzgebung wurde eine Befugnis der Exekutive, und die Rechtsverwaltung war in den Händen der weitverzweigten Bürokratie, die jede Phase des öffentlichen Lebens zu beherrschen anfang. Die Folge war, daß das alte Stadtrecht (*ius civile*) eingeschränkt und der Gegensatz von *ius civile* und dem neuen Recht, von den Exekutivbeamten entwickelt, aufgehoben wurde. So wurden das Recht Roms und das *ius honorarium* der Provinzen in ein harmonisches Ganzes geeint. Andererseits floß unglücklichweise aus der Zentralisation der Rechtspflege eine Zunahme der Gesetzgebung. Das Kleinste wie das Größte wurde durch kaiserliche Edikte geordnet, so daß eine scharfe Abnahme in Kenntnis und Studium des ganzen Rechts stattfand. Dies bestimmte Theodosius II. (408—450), in der von ihm in Konstantinopel als Gegenstück zur athenischen gegründeten Universität zwei Stühle für Jura zu stiften. Erstaunt darüber, daß so wenige mit voller Kenntnis des Zivilrechts zu finden waren, erdrückt von der ungeheuren Menge juristischer Bücher, verschiedener Prozeßführungen und der ungeheuren Menge kaiserlicher Verordnungen, beschloß Theodosius, zwei wichtige Reformen anzubahnen. Die *lex citationum* erklärte fünf bestimmte Juristen als Autoritäten und ihre Schriften für Rechtsquellen unter Vorrang Papinian's. Ferner sollten die Anordnungen, die seit Konstantin erfolgt waren, kodifiziert werden, so daß man nicht mehr auf *responsae* namhafter Rechtsgelehrten zu warten habe. Zwei Kommissionen wurde die Arbeit übertragen. Die erste (429) bestand aus acht Edelleuten und einem Juristen. Die zweite (435) hatte sechzehn Mitglieder. Nach drei Jahren wurde ihr Werk von Theodosius II. im Westen und im Osten und von Valentinian veröffentlicht. Dies ist der *Codex Theodosianus*. Die einzelnen Edikte, Restripte usw. sind darin nicht in chronologischer Reihenfolge aufgeführt, sondern sind nach ihrem Inhalt geordnet, ohne Versuch, die einzelnen Regierungen auseinanderzuhalten.

Vergegenwärtigen wir uns nun die religionspolitische Lage am Anfang des vierten Jahrhunderts. Gallienus hatte vor vierzig Jahren die christliche Religion für *religio licita* erklärt und so den Verfolgungen im großen und ganzen ein Ende gemacht. Diese Ruhezeit wurde durch die wütende Verfolgung unter Diokletian und Galerius teilweise beendet; teilweise, weil die Edikte der beiden Kaiser hauptsächlich im Osten ausgeführt wurden, während große Bezirke des Westens, z. B. Gallien und Britannien, wo Konstantin's Vater Cäsar war und auch Konstantin Einfluß hatte, unbelästigt blieben. 305 trat Diokletian zurück, und Konstantin wurde von den Soldaten 306 zum (westlichen) Mitregenten erwählt. Die westliche Kirche war seit einiger

Zeit durch den Donatistenstreit beunruhigt worden, dem Konstantin sofort ein Ende zu machen strebte, besonders nachdem er sich zum Alleinherrscher gemacht hatte (er veranlaßte die Synode von Arles, 314, und ließ später Bischof Cäcilianus nach Rom und Mailand kommen). Sein Mitkaiser Galerius hob im Jahre 311 seine Verfolgungsgebitte auf, und es hätte Friede und Ruhe im ganzen Reich geherrscht, wenn östliche Unterbeamte das Toleranzgebitte überall befolgt hätten (es war von Galerius, dem von ihm 307 ernannten Mit-Augustus Licinius und Konstantin veröffentlicht worden).

Dieses Toleranzgebitte ist der eigentliche Anfang der nun folgenden Toleranzpolitik der römischen Kaiser, nicht erst das bekannte des Konstantin von „Mailand“. Es lautet: „Unter unsern andern Maßnahmen zum Vorteil des Reichs haben wir versucht, alles mit den alten Gesetzen und der öffentlichen Ordnung der Römer in Einklang zu bringen. Wir sind besonders darauf bedacht gewesen, daß sogar die Christen, welche die Religion ihrer Vorfahren verlassen haben, zur Besserung zurückkehren. Denn sie sind, wir wissen nicht wie, in solche Torheit geraten, daß sie, anstatt jenen alten, wahrscheinlich von ihren eigenen Vorfahren gemachten Einrichtungen anzuhängen, willkürlich eigene Gesetze gemacht und aus verschiedenen Landesteilen verschiedene Völker gesammelt haben. Nachdem wir den Christen befohlen hatten, zur Beobachtung der alten Gebräuche zurückzukehren, haben sich zwar angesichts der Gefahr viele unterworfen, viele aber haben den Tod erlitten. Dennoch, da viele von ihnen auf ihren Meinungen bestehen und weder die Götter verehren noch den Gott der Christen, haben wir es für weise gehalten, sogar diesen Leuten Amnestie zu erteilen und ihnen wieder zu erlauben, Christen zu werden und ihre Versammlungsorte wieder einzurichten, das aber in solcher Weise, daß sie durchaus nicht gegen gute Ordnung handeln. [Diese Bedingung war für übelgefinte Beamte ein Schlupfloch.] Wir beabsichtigen, die Beamten in einem weiteren Mandat über den von ihnen einzuschlagenden Kurs zu instruieren. Daher sollte es Pflicht der Christen sein, in Würdigung unserer Milde zu ihrem Gott um unser Wohlergehen, um das des Reichs und um ihr eigenes zu beten, so daß das Reich in allen Teilen zusammen bleibt und sie selber in ihren Wohnungen sicher leben.“

Dieser kaiserliche Erlass von 311, soweit der Wortlaut geht, gab Christen das Recht, Christen zu bleiben, sagte nichts von irgendeinem Recht, Christ zu werden, nichts von Schadloshaltung für die Verluste der letzten acht Jahre. Er rebete von Amnestie, erklärte also nicht die frühere Politik für ein Unrecht. Die Toleranz bestand nur darin, daß die bestehenden Kirchen aus der Verbrecherklasse gehoben wurden. Ob damit das Recht zugestanden wird, Juden und Heiden zu bekehren und in die Kirchen aufzunehmen, bleibt der Spekulation überlassen; leider sind die verheißenen Beamteninstruktionen nicht mehr vorhanden. Das Zirkular, das Cäsar Maximin an seine Beamten sandte, enthält

nicht einmal die Bestimmung der Kirchen als *religio licita*, sondern befiehlt nur, daß die Verfolgung aufhören müsse. Aber als bald nach Veröffentlichung des Galerius'schen Edikts der Verfasser starb und Maximin dessen Reichsteile überkam und so seine Macht wuchs, zeigte er seine Widerhaarigkeit den Christen gegenüber, und in Asien fing man wieder an, den Kaiser zu „petitionieren“, die Kirche zu stören. Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, Kap. 26, berichtet darüber: „Er führte eine neue Verwaltungsart in Religionsachen ein. Für jede Stadt [Asien] setzte er einen Hohenpriester, aus den höchststehenden Männern gewählt. Dieser hatte jeden Tag all ihren Göttern zu opfern. Mit Hilfe früherer Priester hatte er die Christen an der Errichtung von Kirchen oder am öffentlichen oder privaten Gottesdienst zu hindern. Die Hohenpriester waren autorisiert, die Christen zum Gößenopfer zu zwingen und sie im Falle des Ungehorsams vors Zivilgericht zu bringen. . . . In jeder Provinz stellte er einen Obergerichtspräsidenten an, einen Mann von höchster Würde im Staatsdienst, und befahl, daß alle neu eingesetzten Priester in weißen Kleidern erscheinen sollten, weil das die ehrenvollste Gewänderauszeichnung sei.“

Die Milvische Schlacht wurde im Oktober 312 geschlagen. (Maxentius kam darin um.) Konstantin blieb einige Monate in Rom. Licinius hatte an der Schlacht nicht teilgenommen, sondern von seiner römischen Wohnung aus zugeschaut. (H. Hülle, „Die Toleranzerglasse römischer Kaiser bis 313“, 1895, S. 65.) Der Senat hatte Konstantin die erste Stelle im Kaiserkollegium zuerkannt. Nach einer Angabe in Eusebius' „Kirchengeschichte“ hatten Konstantin und Licinius Ende 312 von Rom aus ein Edikt erlassen und an Maximin im Osten gesandt, wodurch die Kirche als *licita* erklärt wurde. Die Frage, ob es ein solches Edikt von Rom gegeben habe, ist von Geschichtsforschern ausführlich behandelt worden: von McGiffert in seiner Eusebiusausgabe, S. 364, Anm. 7; Hülle, „Die Toleranzerglasse“, S. 64 ff.; Wittig, „Das Toleranzedikt von Mailand“, S. 64 in „Konstantin der Große und seine Zeit“. Pauly-Wissowa in seiner „Realenzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften“ ignoriert sie; Maude Aline Guttman in ihrer Doktorarbeit *The Establishment of Christianity and the Proscription of Paganism*, 1914, referiert über die Gründe für und wider und entscheidet sich für Rom. Allein man kann vieles bei fehlenden positiven Angaben bei gutem Willen mit den Augen des Referierenden ansehen. Unserer Meinung nach bleibt die Frage unbeantwortet. Nach Eusebius' *Vita Constantini*, I, Kap. 12, erließ Konstantin nach seinem Einzug in Rom einen allgemeinen Amnestieerlaß, worin er die Ungerechtigkeiten des Maxentius gutmachte, indem er konfisziertes Eigentum zurückgab, Verbannte zurückrief und Gefangene freiließ. Aber dieser Erlaß bezog sich auf alle von Maxentius Geschädigten, nicht nur Christen. Durch die Niederlage des Maxentius trat ganz von selbst der Erlaß des Galerius auch für das Maxentius'sche Gebiet in Kraft.

Aber trotzdem hatte Konstantin weiteres vor. Ob er innerlich der christlichen Religion als Religion anhing, darüber sind mehr als dreihundert Bücher geschrieben worden. So viel steht fest: er war Monotheist. Aber ob in seinen vierziger Jahren der eine Gott Jehovah oder Christus oder — Apollo war, wird sich wohl nie entscheiden lassen. Aber auch so viel steht fest: er war von Anfang seiner „Alleinherrschaft“ am vollständig entschlossen, eine solche Politik anzubahnen, bei der die wachsende Kirchenmacht dem Reich nicht gefährlich werden könne. Er schlug dazu den Weg ein, auf dem der Staat der Kirche nicht mehr gefährlich werden konnte.

Einige Monate nach der Milvischen Schlacht kamen Konstantin und sein baldiger Schwager Licinius in Mailand zusammen, um sich in bezug auf ihre ganze zukünftige Politik zu vereinbaren, unter anderm auch betreffs der Kirchenfrage. Sie kamen darin überein, die von ihnen gewählte Politik in „einem Edikt“ zu veröffentlichen. Dies ist das bekannte Edikt von Mailand, 313. Der Text findet sich nicht im Codex Theodosianus, sondern ist in Eusebius' „Kirchengeschichte“ (X, Kap. 5) und in Lactantius' *De Mortibus Persecutorum* (Kap. 48) auf uns gekommen. Auch um dieses Edikt ist der Forscherkampf entbrannt: Otto Seed, „Das sogenannte Edikt von Mailand“, in der „Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte“, V, 12, 1891; H. Sülle, „Die Toleranzerglasse“ usw., 1895; Franz Görres, „Eine Bestreitung des Edikts von Mailand“ usw., in der „Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie“, V, 35, 1892. Aber wenn auch anstatt „Edikt Konstantins von Mailand“ zu setzen ist „Dekret des Licinius, gegeben zu Nikomedia“, uns geht hier der Text und sein Inhalt an. Es unterliegt sowieso keinem Zweifel, daß der leitende Geist bei solchen politischen Erörterungen in Konstantins Kopf und nicht in dem des Licinius oder Galerius saß.*) Man darf nicht übersehen, wie solche kaiserlichen Edikte veröffentlicht wurden. Das Edikt eines Kaisers deckte das ganze Reich. Aber da dies in die Regierungsbezirke der einzelnen Nebenkaiser zerfiel, wurden regelmäßig Abschriften an die Regierungsbeamten gesandt, die den einzelnen Kaisern unterstellt waren. So gingen Abschriften eines etwaigen Mailänder Erlasses selbstverständlich nach Bithynien, dem Separatbezirk des Licinius, und nach Jerusalem, dem Bezirk Maximins usw. Lactantius gibt eine solche Abschrift, Eusebius eine andere, während das ursprüngliche Dokument nicht mehr erhalten ist. Tatsache also ist, daß die Politik, die in den Abschriften niedergelegt ist, ihren Ursprung in Mailand hatte.

Was sagt es nun? Lactantius, l. c., Kap. 48 (Msskript nach Nikomedia): „... [nach seiner Rückkehr nach Bithynien] dankte Licinius Gott, durch dessen Hilfe er gesiegt hatte, und Mitte Juni, während er und Konstantin zum drittenmal Konsuln waren, gab er Befehl, folgendes Edikt zur Wiederherstellung der Kirche, an den Präses der

*) Vgl. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, II, 71 f. — D. Red.

Provinz gerichtet, zu veröffentlichen: Als wir, Konstantin und Licinius, Kaiser, in Mailand zusammenkamen und von dem Wohl und der Sicherheit des Reichs handelten, schien es uns, daß unter den den Menschen nützlichen Dingen die der Gottheit dargebrachte Ehrfurcht (*quibus divinitatis reverentia continebatur*) unsere Hauptaufmerksamkeit verdiente und daß mit Recht die Christen und alle andern Freiheit haben sollten, derjenigen Religionsart zu folgen, die jedem die beste zu sein scheint, so daß, was immer Göttliches im Himmel sitzt (*quo quicquid divinitatis in sede coelesti*), uns gütig und günstig sei und jedem unter unserer Regierung. Und daher schien es uns heilsam und vernünftig, daß niemandem untersagt werden sollte, sich dem Ritus der Christen anzuschließen oder einer, wie immer von ihm gewählt, Religion. . . . Daher tun wir euch zu wissen, daß ohne Rücksicht auf unsere früheren Verordnungen betreffs der Christen alle, die diese Religion wählen, absolut frei und ungestört darin bleiben dürfen. Und wir sind deswegen so spezifisch in unsern Instruktionen, damit ihr [die Beamten] versteht, daß die den Christen in Religionsfachen gewährte Rücksicht weitreichend und unbedingt ist und damit ihr gleicherweise wahrnehmt, daß freie und offene Religionsausübung allen andern so gut wie den Christen gestattet ist. Denn es ziemt sich für den wohlgeordneten Staat und die Ruhe unserer Zeit, daß jedem einzelnen gestattet ist, die Gottheit nach eigener Wahl zu verehren (*ut in colendo quod quisque delegerit habeat liberam facultatem*); und wir beabsichtigen, nichts von der irgendeiner Religion oder ihren Anhängern gebührenden Ehre abzuziehen. . . . Wir wollen, daß alle, die konfisierte Kirchen dem Staat oder andern Personen abgekauft haben, diese den Christen zurückerstatten, und zwar vollständig unentgeltlich und ohne Umschweife und ohne Umgehung. Und wir wollen, daß diejenigen, denen solches Eigentum geschenkt wurde, es den Christen wiedergeben, doch so, daß sie von Gerichts wegen dafür entschädigt werden. All dieses Grundeigentum soll sofort den Christen wiedergegeben werden. Und da außer solchen Gotteshäusern die Christen auch anderes Grundeigentum besaßen, das nicht Einzelpersonen, sondern ihrer Gemeinschaft im allgemeinen gehörte, das heißt, ihren Kirchen, so schließen wir all solches in diese Anordnungen ein, und wir wollen, daß es der Gesellschaft oder den Kirchen zurückgegeben werde, und zwar ohne Zögern oder Diskussion. All dies unter der Voraussetzung, daß die Personen, die solches Eigentum wieder herausgeben, dafür vom kaiserlichen Schatz Entschädigung suchen dürfen. . . . Ihr habt diesen Erlass überall zu veröffentlichen." Ähnlich lautet das von Eusebius mitgeteilte kaiserliche Edikt Konstantins und des Licinius. Eusebius (*Kirchengesch.*, X, Kap. 5): „. . . wir beschloffen, sowohl den Christen als allen Menschen die Freiheit zu gewähren, derjenigen Religion zu folgen, die sie wählen. . . . Freiheit soll daher niemandem vorenthalten werden, sich den Christen anzuschließen; aber auch andern

muß Freiheit gewährt werden, ihren Geist der Religion zuzuwenden, die sie für die ihnen angemessenste halten. . . . Jeder soll die Freiheit haben, irgendeine ihm beliebige Gottheit zu verehren.“ Dann folgen dieselben Bestimmungen über Rückerstattung des konfiszierten Eigentums wie im obigen Erlass.

Diese Erlasse sichern in erster Linie den Christen Schutz zu und befreien sie von jeder Verfolgungsfurcht. Aber sie geben der christlichen Religion keinen Vorzug vor andern Religionen, weder vor den alten polytheistischen noch vor den Mysterien, dem Mithraskult, dem Kult der Magna Mater Deorum oder Kybele. Es wird ganz deutlich erklärt, daß alle Religionsverehrungen, ganz einerlei welche, die absolut gleiche Berechtigung haben sollen. Während frühere sogenannte Toleranzgesetze sich damit begnügten, christlichen Kirchen eine gewisse Vergünstigung zukommen zu lassen, wird hier ihre natürliche Berechtigung ausgesprochen unter dem Gesichtspunkt, daß sie als Religionsgemeinschaften dasselbe Recht haben wie alle andern. Das Verhältnis der andern Religionen zum römischen Staat wird dadurch in keiner Weise geändert. Konstantin blieb Pontifex Maximus, im Senatshause blieb die Statue der Siegesgöttin stehen (um die später allerdings ein heftiger Kampf entbrannte), Tempel blieben stehen und wurden benutzt, und heidnische Priester fuhren fort, ihre Privilegien zu genießen. Und wenn auch Konstantin mehrere Kirchen für Christen baute; wenn er es sich auch verbat, daß ein ihm gewidmetes Bauwerk im späteren Konstantinopel mit heidnischem Zeremoniell eingeweiht werde; wenn es auch wahr sein sollte, daß er dem Volk riet, sich dem Christentum zuzuwenden, und sogar ein christliches Glaubensbekenntnis abgelegt hat (Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, II, Kap. 56): so machte er eben nur selbst Gebrauch von den im Edikt dargelegten Grundsätzen. Und wenn auch später noch Taurobolien (heidnische Sakramentszeremonien) gemacht wurden oder öffentliche Bauten mit Inschriften zur Ehre der Magna Mater Deorum versehen wurden, und zwar von Staatsbeamten oder sogar Kaisern, so liegt es doch auf der Hand, daß das Heidentum nicht in die Acht erklärt worden war. Die entschlossenen Versuche, das Heidentum gesetzlich brachzulegen, fallen in die Zeit nach Konstantin, in die Zeit seiner Nachfolger.

Aber noch etwas anderes unterscheidet diese Edikte von den früheren. Gallienus hatte die Kirche für religio licita erklärt und damit, gerade so wie später Galerius, die Verfolgung aufgehoben, weiter nichts. In den Edikten von Mailand wird klar und deutlich vorgeschrieben, daß es insofern rückwirkende Kraft haben sollte, als der den Kirchen zugefügte Schaden wieder gutzumachen sei, soweit das gehe; das geraubte Eigentum wird zurückgegeben oder ersetzt, und zwar auf Staatskosten. Damit wird die frühere Christenfeindschaft des Reichs doch als Fehlpolitik erklärt. Es liegt hier daher eine völlige Umprempe lung der kaiserlichen Politik vor. Und in den nächsten Jahren

folgt Erlaß auf Erlaß, wodurch die völlige Gleichstellung der Kirche mit andern Religionsformen befestigt, der Kirchbau erleichtert, Erwerb von Kirchenvermögen gewährleistet wird und Kirchenbeamten dieselben Vorrechte verliehen werden wie den heidnischen Priestern.

Die Konstantinische Gesetzgebung erstreckt sich über rund vierundzwanzig Jahre; mit Valentinianus vereint war er bis 324. In der Rommensenischen Ausgabe des Codex Theodosianus nimmt die bloße Aufzählung der Titel der Edikte und Reskripte aus diesen vierundzwanzig Jahren fünfzehn Seiten ein. Die darin enthaltene Gesetzgebung erstreckt sich auf mancherlei Gegenstände; sie behandelt selbstverständlich nicht nur kirchliche Angelegenheiten. Manche drücken vorzüglich seine humanitäre Gesinnung aus. Er war den armen Christen gegenüber freigebig und wandte seine Mildtätigkeit besonders den „Jungfrauen“ zu. Juden durften nicht christliche oder andern Religionen angehörige Sklaven beschneiden (Cod. Theod. XVI, 9, 1 [335]); bald nach seinem Einzug in Rom schaffte er die Strafe der Kreuzigung ab; am 21. März 315 verbot er, verurteilte Verbrecher im Gesicht zu brandmarken (Cod. Theod. IX, 40, 2); im Juni 329 schaffte er die Ansetzung Gefangener ab und verlangte beschleunigte Prozessierung (Cod. Theod. IX, 3, 1); 315 befahl er, daß in Italien alle Kinder, deren Väter sich als zu arm auswiesen, aus dem Fiskus und der kaiserlichen Kasse unterhalten werden sollten (die Einrichtung wurde 322 auf Afrika und andere Provinzen ausgedehnt); nach dem Codex Theodosianus (II, 25, 1) durften bei Teilung von Grundeigentum die Sklavenfamilien nicht mehr getrennt werden; am 1. Oktober 325 übergab Konstantin in Beirut, Syrien, dem Präsekt Prätorius Magnus den Befehl, in Zukunft Verbrecher, die früher zu Gladiatorenkämpfen verwandt wurden, lieber zur Vergewerkschaft zu verurteilen, da „blutige Schaustellungen im Frieden non placent“. Aber solche humanitäre Anschauungen brauchen nicht aus dem Christentum zu fließen, sondern können rein menschlicher vernünftiger Überlegung zugeschrieben werden.

Andererseits zeigt die Konstantinische Gesetzgebung deutlich seine persönliche Vorliebe für die Kirche. Zwar manches, was wie eine Bevorzugung aussieht, ist es nicht, sondern ist nur eine auf bestimmte Fälle bezogene Anwendung des im Toleranzedikt niedergelegten Prinzips, so z. B. die Entlastung des Klerus von bürgerlichen Verpflichtungen. Kuriale hatten gewisse Ständelasten zu tragen. Neben der Bezahlung ihrer Steuern hatten sie der Regierung gewisse Dienste zu leisten (die munera), Straßenbauten zu leiten, für den kaiserlichen Fiskus die Steuern pro rata zu verteilen und einzukassieren und hatten die Verantwortung für jedes Defizit in der Steuereinnahme. Die kurialen Pflichten waren erblich. Aber gewisse Berufsclassen waren davon schon längst befreit: Lehrer, Redner (Rechtsanwälte), Priester und Ärzte; denn deren Dienste wurden als Beitrag zur öffentlichen Wohlfahrt angesehen. Diesen fügte Konstantin die christlichen Kleriker

hingu. Eusebius (Kirchengesch. X, Kap. 7): „Diejenigen, die sich dem Dienst der göttlichen Religion widmen und gewöhnlich Kleriker genannt werden, sind von omnibus omnino publicis functionibus frei.“ Das ist aber nicht eine Bevorzugung, sondern nur eine ausdrückliche Einreihung in die Zahl der übrigen Ausnahmen, zu denen auch die (heidnischen) Priester gehörten. Das wurde 319 wiederholt (Cod. Theod. XVI, 2, 2: ab omnibus omnino muneribus excusentur). 326 wurde die Einschränkung hinzugefügt (Cod. Theod. XVI, 5, 1): „Haereticos autem atque schismaticos non solum ab his privilegiis alienos esse volumus, sed etiam diversis muneribus constringi et subiici“ und (Cod. Theod. XVI, 2, 1, im Jahre 313) noch: „Wir haben erfahren, daß die Kleriker der katholischen Kirche durch Häretiker [Donatisten?] so belästigt werden, daß man sie für Ämter und gewöhnliche öffentliche Geschäfte nominiert, entgegen den Entlastungen, die ihnen gewährt sind. Wenn solches vorkommt, ist ein anderer für den betreffenden Geistlichen zu substituieren, und in Zukunft sind Männer von der obengenannten Religion gegen derartiges Unrecht zu schützen.“ Dies Edikt ist wahrscheinlich an Anulinus, Prokonful von Nordafrika, gerichtet und greift in den donatistischen Streit ein.

Ein im Kodex mit dem Datum „17. Juni 315, Konstantinopel“ versehenes Edikt verbietet Steuerbefreiung außer auf kaiserliches Eigentum, Eigentum der katholischen (i. e., orthodoxen) Kirchen, das des Königs Arsaces von Armenien und des „wohlverdienten Eusebius“. (Cod. Theod. XI, 1, 1.) Dieser Eusebius wird im Dokument Exkonful genannt. Er und Arsaces und ein ebenfalls genannter Datianus „floruerunt“, wie Mommsen in einer Anmerkung sagt, „per Constantii tempora extrema“, also etwa 360. (Die Datierung der einzelnen Abschriften ist eine komplizierte Sache. Die Urschriften hatten natürlich nur Angaben wie in dem und dem Konsulat dessen und dessen; die Tages- und Monatsangaben waren allerdings vorhanden.) So ist also dies Edikt für unsere Zwecke unbrauchbar.

Aber der Codex Theodosianus (XVI, 2, 2) befreit wenigstens diejenigen Personen, „die den Gottesdienst leiten“, das heißt, die Kleriker genannt werden, von allen finanziellen Beiträgen (Steuerfreiheit). Das betreffende Edikt ist an den Korrektor Lukaniens und der Bruttii (Süditalien) im Jahre 319 gerichtet und verbietet den dortigen christlichen Klerikern dieselben Rechte wie ihren Kollegen in Nordafrika. (Korrektor ist eine neue Amtsbezeichnung. Eine ganze Menge von Amtsbezeichnungen haben im vierten Jahrhundert infolge der inneren Reformen unter Diokletian und Konstantin eine andere Bedeutung als in früheren Zeiten.)

Unter den neuen, günstigen Verhältnissen wuchs die Kirche und machte die Vermehrung der Kleriker nötig; durch die zugesicherte Entlastung wurden viele Kuriale verlockt, das kirchliche Amt auf sich zu nehmen, wodurch die Leistungen des leistungsfähigen Mittelstandes ver-

ringert und die Würden der übrigen vermehrt wurden. Damit mag es zusammenhängen, daß Konstantin 326 den kuralen oder solchen, die kuralie Pflichten zu leisten fähig waren, den Eintritt in den Kirchen- dienst untersagte. Cod. Theod. XVI, 2, 6: „Wenn ein Kleriker stirbt, soll an seine Stelle ein anderer gesetzt werden, der nicht aus einer kuralen Familie stammt oder Vermögen besitzt. . . . Denn die Reichen müssen die Bürden der Welt tragen; die Armen müssen aus dem Reichtum der Kirchen erhalten werden.“

Kirchen als solche fingen an, reich zu werden. Unter anderm kam dies zustande durch Abschaffung von Testamentseinschränkungen. Schon längst war die Kirche nicht mehr eine nur lose zusammenhängende Menge von Gemeinden (Gemeinschaften), sondern bereits um die Mitte des dritten Jahrhunderts konnte sich im Reich nur die Armee mit der kompakten Organisation der Kirche vergleichen. (T. M. Lindsay, *Cambr. Mediev. Hist.*, V, I, S. 96.) Die Frage, ob Kirchen staatlich berechtigt seien, Geschenke und Vermächtnisse zu empfangen, hängt mit der Frage nach ihren Korporationsrechten zusammen. Es ist bekannt, daß unter Augustus durch die Lex Iulia alle Gesellschaften, Klubs usw. (*collegia*) aufgelöst wurden mit Ausnahme der alten industriellen Zünfte; neue *collegia* bedurften der besonderen Zustimmung des Kaisers. Die neu ersonnenen *collegia* waren *collegia tenuiorum* oder *collegia sodalitatum*; die ersteren hatten wohlthätige Hilfszwecke, gegenseitige Unterstützung, besonders unter den Arbeitern, die letzteren verbanden damit Zwecke sozialer Annehmlichkeiten. Das kaiserliche Verhalten den unzulizenzierten *collegia* gegenüber war ungleich. Lizenzierte *collegia* konnten als „rechtliche Personen“ Eigentum bekommen. Im *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, V. VIII, No. 9585, ist eine Inschrift erhalten, die das Geschenk eines Kirchhofsgrundstücks an die Kirche von Cäsarea bezeugt. Der Wortlaut darauf ist fast in derselben Form gehalten wie bei der Überweisung von Begräbnisstätten an die *collegia* überhaupt. Es liegt daher die Vermutung nahe, daß Kirchen sich als *collegia tenuiorum* einschreiben ließen. Wm. Boyd, *The Ecclesiastical Edicts of the Theodosian Code*, vermutet Gemeindenamen, wie *cultores Verbi*, was ganz mit dem Gebrauch der *collegia* übereinstimmen würde. Somit hatten Kirchen unter gewissen Umständen schon lange vor Konstantin Vermögensrechte, ja die Ausdrücke Tertullians *stipem* (Beiträge), *aream* (Schatz, Kasse), *menstrua* (jeden Monat) finden sich auch in den Inschriften der *collegia*, und wenn Tertullian dafür plädiert, daraufhin die Kirchen nicht Faktionen, sondern *curiae* zu nennen, so brauchen wir nur daran zu denken, daß eben *curia* der afrikanische Ausdruck für *collegium* war. Galten wir also fest: schon früher konnten Kirchen testamentarisch Geschenke empfangen als *collegia*, Privatkollegia.

Nun findet sich aber Cod. Theod. XVI, 2, 4, der Satz: „Idem Augustus [Constantinus] ad populum. Habeat unusquisque licentiam sanctissimae catholicae venerabilique concilio decedens bono-

rum quod optavit relinquere. P(ro)P(osita) v Non. Iul. Rom(ae) Crispo II et Constantino II Caes. Conss. (da Crispus und Konstantin zum zweitenmal zu Konsuln „erwählt“ wurden). Also jeder Sterbende (decedens) sollte das Recht haben, der orthodoxen Kirche so viel von seinen Gütern zu vermachen, wie er wünschte. Hier ist nicht die Rede von collegia, sondern von der (orthodoxen) Kirche. Der Ausdruck concilio im Text hindert uns, an die ganze Kirchengemeinschaft zu denken; es ist eine Lokalgemeinde gemeint. Dies Edikt gibt den Kirchen auch damit eine Ausnahmestellung, daß andere, heidnische, Körperschaften Geschenke nur unter Zustimmung des Volks und mit besonderen Zeremonien empfangen konnten und höchst selten das Recht erhielten, testamentarische Vermächtnisse zu empfangen. Valentinian hat 370 diese Berechtigung eingeschränkt zugunsten von Witwen und Minderjährigen und gegen die Erbschleichereien von Mönchen (Cod. Theod. XVI, 2, 20).

Es war seit langer Zeit keine Seltenheit, daß jemand einem Sklaven die Freiheit schenkte oder sonstwie gewährte (manumissio). Das mußte aber unter gewissen Regeln geschehen: vor Zeugen, beurkundet durch eine Schrift und unter gewissen Zeremonien. Möglicherweise hatte der Sklave im Lauf der Zeit Vieh von seinem Herrn zum Geschenk erhalten (so wurde pecus, Vieh, zu peculium, Eigentum; peculiar people, Volk des Eigentums). So besaß er etwas, womit er seine Freiheit erkaufen konnte. Die Zahlung mußte bescheinigt und ihr Zweck dokumentarisch festgelegt werden. Ebenso bei einfacher, unentgeltlicher Freilassung. Natürlich kamen Freilassungen auch in christlichen Gemeinden vor. Dafür gab Konstantin den Christen gewisse Erleichterungen. Cod. Theod. IV, 7, 1 in einem Schreiben an „Bischof Honosius“ vom 3. Juli 321: „Aber wir geben den Alexikern das weitere Vorrecht, daß, wenn sie ihren Sklaven (suis famulis; im ersten Abschnitt servulis) Freiheit schenken, nicht nur in der Kirche und vor Religionsgenossen, sondern wenn sie dies bloß in ihren Testamenten ausdrücken oder mündlich anordnen, dies ohne gesetzliche Zeugen Geltung haben soll.“ Das ist sogar ein Fortschritt im Vergleich mit dem Schreiben, das Konstantin am 8. Juni 316 an Bischof Protogenes (Cod. Iulianus, I, 13, 1) gerichtet hatte: „Katholische Sklavenbesitzer dürfen schon längst Sklaven freilassen, wenn sie es im Angesicht des Volks und in Gegenwart christlicher Priester unter Aufzeichnung eines Schriftstücks tun. Daher darfst auch du die Freiheit schenken, und zwar unter irgendwelchen dir beliebigen Anordnungen, aber unter der einen Bedingung, daß ein klares Zeugnis für deine Absicht vorhanden ist.“ Wenn die manumissio notwendigerweise vor einem heidnischen Gerichtshof und unter heidnischen Zeremonien stattzufinden hatte, so war sie bei Christen dadurch erschwert. Nun hätte Konstantin die Lösung finden können, daß er solche Zeremonien dabei verbot. Aber er fand die Lösung darin, daß er für gewisse Manumissionen Privilegien gab. Andere Manumissionen blieben, wie sie waren.

Allerdings nähert sich Konstantin hierin bedeutend einer weiteren Gesetzgebung, nämlich der, den kirchlichen Beamten gewisse juristische Vollmachten zu gewähren, woraus die mittelalterlichen Bischofsgerichte sich entwickelten. Gerichtshöfe sind Staatseinrichtungen. Die Gerichte des Reichs standen jedermann, auch den Christen jezt, offen. Aber für die Christen hatte sich aus Matth. 18, 15—17 und 1 Kor. 6, 1—3 die Anschauung festgesetzt, daß das weltliche Gericht ihnen nicht nötig („sage es der Gemeinde“), ja sogar unziemlich sei. Die *Didache*, 14, 2; 15, 3, bezeugt das. Die *Constitutiones Apostolicae*, II, 44—51, und II, 47, beschreiben das geordnete Verfahren. Wenn nun Montags der Bischof inmitten seiner Presbyter und Diakonen Klagen verhörte und darüber entschied, welche Kraft hatte dann sein Urteil staatlich? Cod. Theod. I, 27, 1 23. Juni 318: „Ein Richter soll, wenn ein Fall an das bischöfliche Gericht appelliert wird, seine Prozeßführung sofort einstellen, und wenn irgend jemand seinen Fall an das christliche Gesetz (ad legem Christianam negotium transferre) übertragen und dessen Urteil annehmen will, soll es ihm erlaubt sein, selbst wenn die Verhandlung bereits angefangen hat. Und was immer von ihnen [den Bischöfen] entschieden wird, soll als unverleßlich angesehen werden (pro sanctis habeatur).“ Denken wir uns also folgenden Fall. Ein Christ hat eine Klage gegen einen zweiten Christen, der seinen Zaun auf dem Eigentum des ersten errichtet hat. Er kann nach diesem Gesetz seine Klage dem weltlichen Gericht entziehen und vor seine Kirche, das heißt, deren Bischof, bringen. Das Urteil, das im bischöflichen Gericht gefällt wird, beendet den Fall. War dieser von Anfang an vor dem Bischof verhandelt, so hatte der weltliche Richter sowie so nichts damit zu tun. War der Fall vor dem Magistrat angefangen und dann an den Bischof transferiert, so wurde die Entscheidung des Bischofs an den weltlichen Richter berichtet und mußte von diesem anerkannt und bestätigt werden. Es war auch sonst im Reich anerkannt, daß die Ausführung von außerhalb des Gerichts durch freiwilliges übereinkommen herbeigeführten Entscheidungen von Gerichten wegen erzwungen wurden. (Matthias, „Die Entwicklung des römischen Schiedsgerichts“, 1888; cf. unter anderm das Institut des recepti arbitrii.)

Bedeutend weiter scheint ein Brief Konstantins aus dem Jahre 333 an den Präsektus Prätorio Ablabius zu gehen. Er findet sich in den *Constitutiones Sirmondianae*, die von dem französischen Juristen Sirmond im siebzehnten Jahrhundert aufgefunden wurden. Rommisen hat sie in seine Ausgabe des *Kodex* hinter dem sechzehnten Buch aufgenommen, obwohl Prof. Munroe Smith sie für Fälschungen hielt. Ablabius hatte angefragt, wie er es mit bischöflichen Urteilen zu halten habe. Konstantin drückt sein Erstaunen darüber aus, da das doch längst bekannt sei. Im Verlaufe des Schreibens gibt er Gründe für seine Gunst den Bischofsgerichten gegenüber an, z. B.: Denn (enim) die sacrosanctae religionis auctoritas untersucht und veröffentlicht (publicat)

viele Dinge, die die gewöhnliche, verlausulierte Prozeßordnung nicht vorbringen läßt. Er erwartet wohl hier eine vernünftiger Unterfuchung und Rechtfprechung als bei dem zunftgemäßen Gericht, und die römische Gerichtsverwaltung fand unserer amerikanifchen an widerfinnigen Regeln und Verfehlungen nicht nach. Er wiederholt die Regel, daß alle Bifchofsurteile aufrechtzuerhalten find, ohne Nachprüfung; „denn das trägt den Stempel der Wahrheit an der Stirn und ift tadellos, was von einem homo sacrosanctus ein unberlehter Geift hervorbringt“. Das bedeutet, daß Konftantin eine hohe Achtung vor den epifkopalen Gerichtshöfen hatte. Die größte Bedeutung liegt darin, daß gegen fie nicht appelliert werden konnte, womit den Bifchöfen eigentlich das Anfehen eines Präfektus gewährt wurde. Bei alledem ift aber nicht zu überfehen, daß es fich in diesen kaiserlichen Dekreten nicht um ein Muß, fondern um ein Darf handelte, Prozesse vor den Bifchof zu bringen. Das Muß befchränkt fich auf die ftaatliche Anerkennung ihrer Entfcheidungen.

Der Sonntag. Am 3. März 321 gab Konftantin fein Sonntagseß (Cod. Iul., Kaifer Konftantin an Hefpidus, praeses Sardiniae): „Alle Richter und Stadtbewohner und alle Handwerker föllen am verehrten Tag der Sonne ruhen“ (das heißt, Gerichtshöfe, Geldinstitute, Werkstätten find gefchloffen). Landleute aber mögen ungeftört nach ihren Wünfchen ihrem Aderbau nachgehen, da es häufig vorfommt, daß kein anderer Tag fo günftig für die Ausfaat und für das Pflanzen von Weinföden ift, fo daß der von der Vorfehung gewährte günftige Augenblick nicht verlorenggeht.“ Der Ruhetag wird der Tag der Sonne genannt, nicht Tag des HErrn. Die Verehrung des Sonnengottes war die am weitesten verbreitete. Unter den Chrißen war diefer Tag zwar unter dem Namen „Tag des HErrn“ längft ein Feiertag geworden, befonders von der Zeit an, als die Miffion fich außer an die Juden auch an die fabbatlofen Heiden wandte. Die Feftfegung eines bestimmten Feiertages überhaupt ift bei Konftantin aus dem Wunfche gefloffen, in die Gerichts-, Handels- und Induftriewelt Ordnung zu bringen, indem für alle ein und derfelbe bestimmte Tag feftgefegt wurde, an dem Gerichte, Handelsinstitute usw. nicht angeprochen werden konnten, da bei Unbefimmtheit der „gefchloffenen Tage“ mancher Gang umfonft gemacht worden wäre. Von der Gefezherabung des chrißlichen Feiertags ift nicht die Rede. Das geht auch aus einem vier Monate fpäter gegebenen Erlaß hervor. Am 1. Juli 321 (Cod. Theod. II, 8, 1) fchrieb er an denselben Hefpidus: „Wie es höchft unwürdig schien, daß der Tag der Sonne, durch feinen verehrungswürdigen Charakter angefehen, mit den Streitigkeiten der Gerichte angefüllt werden follte, fo ift es etwas Schönes, an dem Tage folche Dinge auszuführen, die befonders wünschenswert find. Daher föllen an dem Fefttage alle das Recht haben, eine manumiffio vorzunehmen, und die damit verbundenen öffentlichen

Tätigkeiten sollen nicht verboten sein.“ Öffentliche Institute sind am Sonntag für Manumissionen offen.

Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, II, Kap. 43, berichtet, daß Konstantin im Osten des Reichs mit Vorliebe Christen zu Gouverneuren der Provinzen ernannte und verbot, diese (etwa durch Opfern) zu beleidigen. Aber andererseits gebot er, gewisse heidnische Gebräuche anzuwenden, oder gestattete es doch. Im Falle der Palast oder ein anderes Staatsgebäude vom Blitz getroffen würde, sollten „nach der Weise der alten Zeremonien“ die Haruspizes untersuchen, was das zu bedeuten habe. Deren Erklärungen sollten sorgfältig gesammelt und ihm gebracht werden. (Cod. Theod. XVI, 10, 1, 17. Dez. 320 oder 321. Auch andern ist die Erlaubnis, Haruspizien zu machen, unter Ausschluß häuslicher Opfer gewährt.) Mitunter findet sich allerdings in den Bemerkungen Konstantins ein scharfer Spott über den heidnischen Aberglauben. So in Cod. Theod. IX, 16, 1, 319. Hier wird es Haruspizes verboten, mit ihrer „Kunst“ von Haus zu Haus zu gehen, und dann hinzugefügt: „Die dem Aberglauben Frönenden mögen ihren Ritus öffentlich praktizieren.“ Daß Haruspizium an sich nicht verboten war, zeigt auch Cod. Theod IX, 10, 2, 15. Mai 319: „Gehet doch [ihr Haruspizes] zu den öffentlichen Altären und haltet dort eure Zeremonien; denn wir verbieten nicht die vollen Dienste der alten Tradition bei Tageslicht.“

Nun noch eine Entscheidung Konstantins aus dem letzten Jahre seines Lebens. Cod. Theod. XII, 5, 2. Mai 337. Priester und flamines perpetui sind nicht zu annonarum praeposituris zu machen (im Gesetz von 335 praepositis mansionum). Diese praepositi hatten die Versorgung der Reifestationen unter sich, die die Regierung unterhielt. Solche Ämter galten als geringer in Würde als die der Priester, flamines und Defurionen. Es handelt sich für uns hier um die immer noch aufrechterhaltene Ausnahmestellung der heidnischen Priester. Beide Schreiben sind an die afrikanische Regierung gerichtet, wo es eine ziemlich starke christliche Bevölkerung gab.

Konstantin hat viele Weise gegeben, daß er die Christen und ihre Kirchen bevorzugte, daß er das Christentum zur herrschenden Religion wachsen sehen wollte; er hat das Heidentum geringgeschätzt, wenn er auch viele angesehenen Heiden zu seinen Freunden zählte; er hat es zu verdrängen gesucht. Aber er hat es nicht geächtet. Erst seine Söhne und deren Nachfolger betraten den Weg der Antiheiden-Gesetzgebung, die erst im Anfang des fünften Jahrhunderts abgeschlossen ist.

R. W. Heinke.

The Study of the Apocrypha by the Preacher.

Luther had a better appreciation of the apocryphal writings of the Old Testament than the English translators. He carefully translated them and appended them to the Old Testament canon. He did more than that. He recommended these strange and non-inspired books, which have no place in the Old Testament Bible, as "useful reading." To-day these writings have almost come to be regarded as obsolete in our circles. Many of our children have never seen them; we pastors scarcely find time to read them occasionally.

A new interest in these all but forgotten non-inspired books was stimulated during the recent quadricentenary of the first printed English Bible. They were exhibited along with some of the earlier translated editions of the English Bible. This is true especially of the Authorized Version of the Apocrypha, completed in 1611 and revised by a group of Oxford and Cambridge scholars in 1894. The names of Bishop Westcott, Dr. Hort, and Dr. Moulton are a sufficient guaranty of the scholarly fidelity and accuracy of the new version of these books. Their reappearance in popular and inexpensive form (Oxford University Press, 1929) as part of the world's classics has stimulated many college and high-school teachers to recommend them to students of literature as supplementary reading.

There is no lack of aids for the study of the Apocrypha and the apocryphal era by the pastor who is expected to be informed in this somewhat obscure field of Hebrew history and literature. The most elaborate work, which will meet the most critical demands of the student of apocryphal times and literature, appeared under the title *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*. Its author is the Englishman R. H. Charles, Litt. D., D. D. The two comprehensive volumes appeal primarily to the student of what is called "Apocrypha" as well as of the body of literature, mainly of an apocalyptic character, which goes under the name of "Pseudepigrapha" (the Book of Enoch, the Sibylline Oracles, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Psalms of Solomon, the Book of Jubilees, and six others). This great work of Charles first appeared in the early nineties, but it is unsurpassed even to this day. The only drawback of these two volumes is their expensiveness. A German work of similar title by Kautzsch (*Die Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*) was published during the period of revived interest in the apocryphal writings. Its footnotes bristle with scholarly research and painstaking textual comparisons, which lead the student far afield. But like Charles's two volumes Kautzsch's books are too expensive and too exhaustive for the busy pastor. A usable and inexpensive book dealing with the origin, teaching, and contents of the apocrypha is written by W. O. E. Oosterley, warden of the Society

of the Apocrypha, London Diocese (Fleming H. Revell Co., 1914).* The book is divided into two parts: Prolegomena to the Apocrypha and Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha. The author justifies the first part of his book with the statement that an intelligent reading of this body of ancient literature necessitates an acquaintance with a number of topics which do not at first sight seem to show a direct connection with the apocryphal writings (The Hellenistic Movement; Hellenistic Influence upon the Jews of Palestine and of the Dispersion; The Apocalyptic Movement; The Scribes; The Pharisees and Sadducees; The Origin of the Old Testament Canon). The second half of the book deals with the title, the authorship, and the contents and doctrinal teaching of the books of the Apocrypha. Briefly, Oesterley's book is all a busy student needs for supplementary reading in the field of apocryphal literature of the Old Testament.

The question recurs, however, Is it worth while? Will it repay the minister to make a somewhat careful study of this collection of writings not inspired? We think it will, and we shall point out in this article a few reasons why it will.

The value of a study of the Apocrypha and the era in which they were written will be found in its historical bearings. There is a historical gap between the close of the prophetic age and the beginning of the New Testament dispensation. Malachi's prophetic utterances were the last of that long row of inspired books which constitute the Old Testament canon. According to the best sources of information Malachi lived ca. 433—424 B. C. That leaves some four hundred years up to the coming of Christ unaccounted for. Without the Apocrypha and the history surrounding them this period would be a complete blank to us. What knowledge of American history would we have if there were a gap between the times of Jefferson and Lincoln?

What did happen in this period of Jewish history? First of all we see the spiritual disintegration of God's people under foreign domination. The reader will recall that the decline of Israel as God's people had its beginning in the final years of King Solomon's reign. "And Solomon did evil in the sight of the Lord. . . . And the Lord said unto Solomon . . . : 'I will surely rend the kingdom from thee,'" 1 Kings 11, 6, 11. There followed the division of the kingdom of David and Solomon into two parts. The Kingdom of Judah outlasted the northern half by more than a century. In 586 B. C. Judah was conquered by the armies of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, and a large number of its people were taken away as captives. These captives, it seems, were allowed to settle in fertile sections near the

* Cp. *An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha*. By W. O. E. Oesterley. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1935. 345 pages. (Ed. Board.)

city of Babylon and to carry on their own manner of life. Two generations later the Babylonian Empire was overthrown by Cyrus, king of the Medes and Persians, and a decree was issued permitting the Jews to return to their native land. Only a small number (Ezra 2, 64) took advantage of the opportunity, so that later Nehemiah and Ezra, lamenting the ruined state of Jerusalem, urged the Babylonian Jews to give up their more comfortable life in Babylon in order to help rebuild the destroyed walls and homes of their native land. With the walls rebuilt and the Temple repaired and with the inducement afforded by patriotic and vigorous leadership, there seems to have taken place a steady movement of return to Jerusalem and its surroundings. But any possible hopes of a worldly kingdom were doomed to disappointment. Palestine remained under Persian domination for over two centuries (538—332 B. C.) in spite of several disastrous attempts to throw off the yoke. Finally the Persian Empire crumbled and fell into the hands of the fiery young conqueror from Macedon, Alexander the Great, 331 B. C. But instead of liberty the Jews only gained an exchange of foreign potentates. After Alexander's sudden death the Ptolemies of Egypt extended their kingdom northward; so the Jews were catapulted into the hands of the Egyptian monarchs (320—198 B. C.). Then they passed as the spoils of war to Syria, whose kings, Greek by descent and called the Seleucidae, ruled over them from Antioch. These rulers treated the Jews brutally. An organized effort was made by King Antiochus Epiphanes to wipe out the Jewish faith. His soldiers pillaged and burned every place which bore the semblance of a house of worship. Antiochus reigned from 175—164 B. C. His tyrannical treatment of the Jews led to the successful rebellion under the leadership of Judas Maccabeus, who inspired the Jews by his fiery patriotism against the attempted Hellenization of Antiochus. An intensive nationalism was created by his victories. Judas Maccabeus sought to safeguard the hard-earned victory by gaining the favor of the nation which at that time was quickly rising to a position of world dominance—Rome. "Now Judas heard of the fame of the Romans, that they are powerful and strong and willingly agree to all things that are requested of them, and that whosoever have come to them they have made amity with them, and that they are mighty in power. And they heard of their battles and their noble acts which they had done in Galatia, how they had conquered them and brought them under tribute, and how great things they had done in the land of Spain . . . and had conquered places that were very far off from them and kings that came against them from the ends of the earth, . . . and that they had defeated in battle Philip and Perseus, . . . and how Antiochus, the great king of Asia, was routed by them . . . and the country of the Indians and of the Medes and of the Lydians. . . .

So Judas chose Eupolemus, the son of John, . . . and Jason, the son of Eleazar, and he sent them to Rome to make a league of amity and confederacy with them" (1 Macc. 8). This interesting chapter then goes on to give the terms of the treaty the Roman senate made with this delegation of Jews. It was in effect a mutual-protection treaty, drawn up most advantageously for the Romans, as subsequent chapters of Maccabees reveal. But Jewish independence was short-lived. Shortly after his alliance with Rome, Judas was surprised by the overwhelming armies of Demetrius and decisively defeated. "And Judas was slain, and the rest fled away, . . . and all the people of Israel bewailed him . . . and said: How is the mighty man fallen that saved the people of Israel!" (1 Macc. 9). The successors of the first generation of the Maccabees were ambitious, cruel, inefficient, and even indifferent to the religion of their people, and independence gave way to civil war and civil war to intervention. The Romans, finding the Jews unable to keep their trade routes to the Orient open and patrolled and vainly reminding the Jewish leaders of their treaty obligations, marched their legions into Judea under Pompey in 63 B. C. and captured Jerusalem after a desperate resistance. From then on the Roman grip on the country was never broken.

Now let us see what happened to the religion of God's people during these centuries. In the first place, the continuous domination of the Jews by pagan powers which crumbled and rose again led many of them to a world outlook which slowly, but surely became pessimistic. God's kingdom seemed far off. The more they meditated over their national misfortune, the more they gave the prophetic utterances concerning the coming of the Messiah and the establishment of His kingdom a temporal or an apocalyptic meaning. The day of the deliverance of God's people according to the apocryphal writers would mean the punishment of Babylonia, Persia, Syria, and Rome. It would also be the day of the destruction of Satan. "His kingdom shall appear throughout all creation. Then Satan shall be no more, and all sorrow shall depart with him" (Assumption of Moses, 10, 1).

Many of us are surprised to hear the disciples asking Jesus even after His resurrection: "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom of Israel?" Acts 1, 6. Yet the view of the temporal restoration of Israel by a temporal Messiah was so deeply grafted into the minds of the Jews during the apocryphal era that Jesus, even with all His emphasis on the true character of the kingdom of God and the mission of His Messiahship, did not eradicate it. That Jews in the days of Jesus still thought of the restoration of the Kingdom in terms of a victory over Rome and a recovery of lost political power is evident when we glance at the literature from

200 B. C. to 100 A. D. The earthly restoration of the Kingdom would come first and would last five hundred or a thousand years; then would begin the spiritual kingdom. The spiritual kingdom is the new heaven and the new earth. But not the new heaven and the new earth as Christ preached it and as the New Testament teaches it; to these apocalyptic-minded Jews the newness was in effect only a transformed Jerusalem transplanted somewhere in the stratosphere or thereabouts. It had all the earmarks of the old Solomonic city itself: the walls were there, the homes, and even the Temple. Some one has said that these Jews of the apocalyptic era not only conceived of heaven as the transplanted Jerusalem, they even took the Jerusalem furniture with them on their journey to it, so mundane was their belief in the world to come.

The doctrinal teaching of the Apocrypha offers the best reasons why these books should be kept separate from the canonical writings and not be used as sources of religious authority. We know that they contain many statements which are legendary, erroneous, or even contrary to Biblical doctrine. The additions to the Book of Daniel are easily discernible as fiction of a fantastic character. The Book of Baruch contains many false statements about the record of Jeremiah. In the Book of Tobit an angel of God gives a young man instructions for practising witchcraft, in 2 Macc. 12, 43 ff. and 14, 41 ff. both intercession for the dead and the act of suicide are spoken of with approval. (This explains why the Roman Church in the Council of Trent, 1545—1563, decreed that these books must be considered of equal authority with the canonical books of the Bible and acknowledges them as sources of doctrine.) It is true that the more important of these books were recognized by official Judaism of that period as containing good orthodox teaching concerning the doctrine of God, of the Law, of sin, of grace and free will, of the Messiah, of the future life, of angels, of demonology, and of wisdom. But a closer examination of the Apocrypha, including the pseudepigraphic works, such as the Book of Enoch, the Sibylline Oracles, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Book of Jubilees, the Psalms of Solomon, the Assumption of Moses, the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, and the Ascension of Isaiah, leads the reader to the conclusion that the background of these books in the domain of doctrine is not solely the Old Testament, but also Persian and Greek influences in certain directions. Not only did these foreign influences flow in upon Judaism as God's prophets predicted they would, but Judaism even went out to meet them. Thus Fairweather correctly says: The hitherto unbroken river of Old Testament ideas and doctrines divided itself at this point into three separate streams, . . . causing the tributaries of Persian and Greek ideas by which these streams were fed to be of a composite character exceedingly difficult to analyze

so as to say definitely, This is Jewish; that is Persian, or, This is Jewish; that is Greek. (Hastings, D. B., V., p. 275.)

Some scholars see in the apocryphal writings a number of points of contact with the teachings of the Bible set forth in the New Testament. But their claim that doctrinally we have in this body of literature the background of the New Testament, is altogether unjustifiable. The parallels between the Apocrypha and the New Testament writings are more than offset by their doctrinal contrasts. To say that St. Paul, for example, dipped into this rabbinical literature and there found his material for the doctrine of sin, faith, and works is not consistent with the facts. Undoubtedly the apostle, who was trained in rabbinic Judaism, was familiar with these uncanonical books. But that does not justify the conclusion that he embodied their doctrinal teachings or eschatological content in his letters. On the contrary, many examples can be cited which show how diametrically opposite to the doctrines of the Apocrypha are those of the apostle concerning the Law, works, and justification by faith.

Take, for instance, the teaching concerning the Law. The position assigned to the Law in the apocryphal writings represents the pharisaic belief and practise regarding it. It was a dead letter. Jesus reinterpreted it and expounded to His people its true God-given meaning. St. Paul saw clearly by inspiration of God this difference between Jesus' and the pharisaic, or rabbinical, meaning of the Law, so that here we have a contrast between Apocrypha and New Testament which is fundamental. A non-pharisaic conception of the Law is found in the Apocrypha only in one or two instances, as, for example, 2 Esdras 3, 22; 9, 36, where the Law is represented as inadequate to save from sin. But nothing in the apocryphal books, so far as we know, approximates St. Paul's interpretation of the meaning of the Law which he presents in Rom. 2, 17—29 and 3, 19.

The doctrine of good works, the merit acquired thereby, of justification before God, as found in the Apocrypha represents the pharisaic doctrine of justification by the deeds of the Law, which is in sharp contrast to the teachings of the New Testament on the subject. In the Book of Tobit, for example, we are told: "Give alms of thy substance. . . . If thou have little, be not afraid to give alms according to that little; for thou layest up a good treasure for thyself against the day of necessity, because alms delivereth from death and suffereth not to come into darkness. Alms is a good gift in the sight of the Most High for all that give it" (Tobit 4, 7—11; 12, 9). See also 14, 11, where the aged Tobit assures his son of what alms can do "and how righteousness does deliver." In Ecclesiasticus the writer assures us that good works atone for sin (Ecclus. 3, 3. 14. 15) and that he who accomplished good works is righteous (*tzaddik*), i. e., one who

is justified in the sight of God (cf. 9, 17); his state of justification is due to his good works (cf. 3, 31; 11, 27; 17, 22; 29, 9; 31, 9. 10, etc; 2 Esdras 8, 33). Contrast the words of St. Paul with these quotations. Rom. 3, 20: "By the works of the Law shall no flesh be justified in His sight"; Rom. 3, 28; Gal. 3, 2. It would be unusual to find a passage in the Apocrypha where the thought is expressed that God is merciful even to those who have a poor record of good works. The prayer in 2 Esdras 8, 32: "For if Thou hast a desire to have mercy upon us, then shalt Thou be called merciful to us, namely, that have no works of righteousness," is remarkable and does not at all typify the teaching of the Apocrypha on the subject of God's grace.

Much more could be written to show the wide contrast between the New Testament teaching concerning the Messiah, his true character as He revealed Himself to us, the hereafter, angelology, the resurrection of the dead, etc., and the teaching of the apocryphal writings on these points. But this would carry us too far afield. Oesterley's latest book (*An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha*; Macmillan, 1935) covers the subject in great detail. The tendency of extreme theologians of our day is to harmonize the teachings of the Apocrypha with the doctrines of the New Testament or to make them appear as a true background for the New Testament. The pastor of to-day cannot afford to let this sinister development go by unchallenged. We shall always be compelled, therefore, to regard the apocryphal books as such as are to be read for "example of life and instruction of manners," but not "to establish any doctrine."

Finally, in these days of wide-spread reading, when college and high-school graduates sit in the pew and not infrequently give evidence of some acquaintance with the literature of Bible lands, the value of the Apocrypha to the minister is further seen by considering their literary interest. As literature these writings have a rich variety of form. Unlike the canonical books, the apocryphal writings show plainly the modifying influence of Hellenic thought and culture. This as well as the absence of the influence of inspiration differentiates the non-inspired from the inspired Jewish literature. In the Apocrypha we have poetry, history, gnomic literature, or that of proverbial sayings. So will the narrative parts of the Apocrypha, whether they be found in the real history, as in the books of the Maccabees, or in the legendary, as in the story of Bel and the Dragon, or in the entertaining story of Tobit, or in the fascinating and intensely nationalistic "Jewish domestic novel" of Judith, have a value for any reader who delights in the more primitive literary forms. The pictures these books give of Jewish life and manners in the age just before Christ will commend themselves to all who want to know what conditions of life prevailed in Jewry before the advent of Jesus in the fulness of time. Likewise the poetical strains in the Apocrypha

must have interest for any one who delights in religious poetry. Take for example the Song of the Three Holy Children. Certainly the writer of this song must have been acquainted with Psalm 146, of which it is an echo. There is glow, uplifting power, and rich devotion in its verse. Or take as another specimen the description of wisdom, Wisdom of Solomon, 7, 22; 8, 1, of which Dr. Westcott once said: "This magnificent description of wisdom must rank among the noblest passages of human eloquence." The distinctive feature of the apocryphal books as literature, if not also as religious thought, will be found in the gnomic books, the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus. In gnomic poetry the Hebrew literature is especially rich, for the Hebrew language enables pithy sentences to be concentrated into a few pregnant words. In Ecclesiasticus will be found also specimens of a grim humor and biting irony, of which the following examples may be pointed out: the itch of the scandal-monger to tell his tale (9, 10—12), the folly of the man that "buildeth his house with other men's money" (21, 8). Who cannot appreciate the wit in this: "A slip on the pavement is better than a slip with the tongue"?

This will go to show that the apocryphal books do have a place as valuable reading even for the busy and overworked pastor of to-day. Nothing should ever be done to create the impression that they are put on the same level with the canonical books. But now that modern research has shed much additional light on the apocryphal era in connection with the study of New Testament background, a repeated perusal of these books will be of great value to us pastors.

An interesting and profitable course of lectures might grow out of a study of the apocryphal books. Such a course would treat of the history of the books themselves; of the history of the Jewish nation between the Old and the New Testament; of the essential difference between these books and the inspired writings; of the origin and rise of the religious parties, or sects, Pharisees and Sadducees; of the development of rabbinic Judaism, etc.

Valparaiso, Ind.

H. H. KUMNICK.

Are We Using Our Septuagint?

The Septuagint challenges our interest from practically every angle from which we may approach its study. Its *history*, which for centuries was the subject of strange speculations, has only recently been cleared of the accumulation of these theories. Shorn of these mythical accretions, the story of the Septuagint may be reduced to the following facts. The instigation came from Ptolemy Philadelphus, King of Egypt, ca. 283—247 B. C., who desired a translation of the Jewish holy books for the great library founded by his father. The work was not done at one time, as has been stated, much less by a

group of exactly seventy-two learned Jews, but in the course of approximately a century and a half, one of the chief men concerned being Jesus ben-Sira. As Ottley remarks (*A Handbook of the Septuagint*, 35): "By 100 B. C. or thereabouts the Greek Bible must have been nearly complete." Just before that he remarks: "We may believe, then, without hesitation, that the Law, the Pentateuch, with which alone Aristeas is concerned, was translated at Alexandria, probably within fifty years of the date indicated in the 'Letter' [namely, that of Aristeas to Philocrates, on which the ancient narrative is based]. The translation of the remaining books followed, bit by bit, during the next century and a half. In some cases one book of a group may have been translated first, as I Kingdoms among the historical books or Isaiah among the prophets; or again, some separate passages, used as lessons in the synagog, may have been first interpreted when these lessons were read, then committed to writing, and later used as instalments of the translations of those books in which they occur. Various hands would of course be employed in the work, as it extended over several generations; and the books which do not belong to the Hebrew Old Testament, whether original or translated, were added, from time to time, to the Alexandrian collection." If we wish to stay more closely with the traditional view, we may assume, with the editor of the Bagster Septuagint, that the Septuagint version had been commenced prior to the year 285 B. C. "and that in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus [283—247] either the books in general or at least an important part of them had been completed." This still permits us to assume that the work was not definitely completed until approximately 150 B. C.

A second point of interest which really amounts to a problem is the question of *the manuscripts from which the translation was made*. It was presumably made from the best available copies of the Hebrew Old Testament, either from manuscripts obtained in Jerusalem for this particular purpose or from such manuscripts as were contained in the great library at Alexandria. And here one of the greatest difficulties is connected with the fact that the Septuagint in various places has sections which are not found in the standard Hebrew text as we now have it. The Bagster editor has the following paragraph on this question: "In examining the Pentateuch of the Septuagint in connection with the Hebrew text and with the copies preserved by the Samaritans in their crooked letters, it is remarkable that in very many passages the readings of the Septuagint accord with the Samaritan copies where they differ from the Jewish. We cannot here notice the various theories which have been advanced to account for this accordance of the Septuagint with the Samaritan copies of the Hebrew; indeed, it is not very satisfactory to enter into the details of the subject because no theory hitherto brought forward explains *all*

the facts or meets *all* the difficulties. To one point, however, we will advert because it has not been sufficiently taken into account, — in the places in which the Samaritan and Jewish copies of the Hebrew text differ in *important and material points*, the Septuagint accords *much more* with the Jewish than with the Samaritan copies, and in a good many points it introduces variations unknown to either." An explanation which would agree with the psychology of the situation and fully satisfy the conservative Bible scholar is this, that the Alexandrian translators added the Samaritan expansions of the authentic Hebrew text to their translation in order to have all the glosses and explanatory material complete. The careful reader of the Septuagint who compares every section with the original will readily see the difference in content and tone of the text. Nevertheless this is one of the difficulties which further work in a scientific study of the Septuagint will attempt to solve. Fortunately the quotations from the Septuagint in the New Testament are not appreciably involved in this problem. The difficulty does not include the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and Hesychius, and the recension of Origen, except as certain emendations of the text of the Septuagint may have crept into some copies.

Another interesting feature which challenges the attention of every student of the Septuagint is the fact that the *variety of translators* naturally resulted in a very unequal character of the version. Some books bear evidence of the fact that the men who attempted their translation were by no means equal to the task, while others indicate that the work was very capably performed. Most scholars agree that the Pentateuch was very well executed, while Job and the Book of Isaiah show the very opposite. It is evident from the outset that the men who did the work were learned Jews, who, moreover, were filled with the most profound respect for the holy writings. In other words, they adhered to the traditional understanding of the Scriptures as they had been taught. They did not consciously inject into their translation any views they may have held for their own persons; they attempted to offer an objective translation. Therefore any inaccuracies and inadequacies in the text are not to be ascribed to dishonest intentions on the part, but simply to the incompetency of some of the translators, whether as to exact knowledge of many of the Hebrew terms or a failure on their part to find Greek words and expressions which would adequately convey the sense of the original. "One difficulty which they had to overcome was that of introducing theological ideas, which till then had their proper terms only in Hebrew, into a language of Gentiles, which till then had terms for no religious notions except those of heathens. Hence the necessity of using words and phrases in new and appropriated senses."

The language of the Septuagint is *Greek*, a fact which is closely associated with the conquest of the greater part of Asia and a large part of Northern Africa by Alexander the Great between 334 and 323 B. C. Yet it is *not the so-called classical Greek*, that written by the authors of the Golden Age of Greek literature, but the post-Attic Greek in the Alexandrine idiom. (Cp. "Notes on the Greek of the Septuagint and the New Testament," in *Theological Quarterly*, Oct., 1920.) One might well call it the Greek as developed in the University of Alexandria, one which might well bear the designation "the written *Koine*." The most striking phenomena of the Alexandrine dialect are, according to the article just referred to: the blending, fusion, simplification of verb inflection as to the preterit tenses, especially in the fusion of the first and second aorist; the emphatic duplication of the verb in prediction, warning, etc., as in the Hebrew; the iteration for the relative; the breaking down of the exact use of prepositions; the luxuriance of articular infinitives in a great multitude of syntactical forms, and other peculiarities. A working knowledge of these phenomena enables the student to grasp the intended meaning of the text with much greater facility.

If the Septuagint carries no other appeal to the average pastor, it challenges his attention on account of the quotations from it included in the New Testament, which are usually given as 215, with 32 in Matthew, 36 in Romans, and 33 in Hebrews alone. The problems associated with these quotations are not beyond solution; but they do require careful study, partly on account of their form, partly on account of their content. We have but to think of Matt. 2, 15 and 23 to realize that the Lutheran theologian must be sure of his ground. Or take the example of Matt. 1, 23. In a recent article on the "History of the Septuagint Text" we read: "In the frequent disputations that took place between the Jews and the Christians the latter often made quotations from the LXX which the former could not regard as conclusive. These were, in part, concerned with inaccurate translations, of which a well-known example is the rendering of עֶלְמָה, Is. 7, 14, by παρθένος, which has been ever recurring in all polemical writings against the Jews." It seems strange to find such a concession in a Protestant discussion of the Isaiah passage, especially in view of the fact that the Holy Ghost has sanctioned the translation of παρθένος in Matt. 1, 23. But similar problems await the student in scores of other passages quoted in the New Testament from the Septuagint. It is not merely that one must be sure of his actual translation of a given passage, but he ought to have the full background of the context also in the Old Testament, both in the Hebrew and in the Greek. In other words, a working knowledge of the Septuagint is practically indispensable for scientific work in both the Old and the New Testament.

The number of manuscripts of the Septuagint is not very great if compared with the manuscripts of the New Testament, but the list nevertheless presents a formidable array. There are approximately thirty codices in uncials, about half of which are complete. Among these Codex B, the Vaticanus, of the fourth century, now in the Vatican Library in Rome, supposed to be one of the fifty copies which Constantine deputed Eusebius to have prepared at Caesarea, Codex S (or Σ), the Sinaiticus, found by Tischendorf in 1844 at St. Catherine's Convent on Mount Sinai, formerly in Leningrad, now in London, and Codex A, the Alexandrinus, which was brought to England after the accession of Charles I, are considered the most authentic and valuable, and they are basic in all recent editions of the Greek version. There are more than one hundred cursives of the Septuagint, thirty of which were regarded as important enough to be considered in the Cambridge Septuagint. The poetical books are found in about 180 cursives, and of these about 130 are Psalters or contain little else, except sometimes the canticles or hymns.

Of greater interest to the average Bible student are the printed editions of the Septuagint, as they are available partly in the libraries of universities and of large cities, partly in private libraries of specialists in the field. We merely refer to the Septuagint text contained in the *Complutensian Polyglot*, published in 1521, at Alcalá, near Madrid, the *Aldine* edition, printed after, but published before, the Complutensian, in February, 1518, and the *Sixtine* edition, published at Rome in 1587, under Pope Sixtus V, because these editions are accessible to the scholar in only a few libraries. The situation is not much better with regard to the edition begun by Johannes Ernst Grabe, who himself finished two volumes before his death, in 1712, and whose work was completed by Francis Lee and George Wigan (1719 and 1720); for this edition is also rare. More accessible to the average scholar in the field are the great editions by Holmes and Parsons (the *Oxford Edition: Vetus Testamentum Graece*, edd. Holmes et Parsons, *Oxonii 1798—1827*) and that by Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (the *Cambridge Edition: The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of the Codex Vaticanus*, supplemented from other uncial manuscripts, with a critical apparatus containing the variants of the chief ancient authorities for the text of the Septuagint). Not quite beyond the reach of the less opulent individual scholar is the Septuagint edition furnished by H. B. Swete (*The Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge, 3 vols.; first edition, 1887—94). This was, till recently, the best edition for general desk use. In Germany we have the Goettinger Septuagint (*Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Literarum Gottingensis editum*), of which Volume IX, fasc. 1, has recently appeared.

In keeping with the question in our caption we are especially

interested in less expensive editions, which are accessible to the average pastor and student in the field. Bagster has issued *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, with an English Translation*, the text being eclectic, the Sixtine text being used, with variants of Grabe's text at the beginning or the end of each book, therefore containing hexaplar matter, but not marked as such. The translation was prepared by Launcelot Charles Lee Brenton. This is a handy volume for comparison and will serve for cursory reading and quick reference work.

But the edition of the Septuagint to which we want to call particular attention is that which was recently issued by the Privilegierte Wuertembergische Bibelanstalt in Stuttgart (*Septuaginta, id est, Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX Interpretes, edidit Alfred Rahlfs*). This edition combines scientific accuracy and completeness with inexpensiveness and should therefore have a strong appeal for every student of the Bible who knows any Greek, no matter how little. The text of this edition is based mainly upon Codex B, or the Vaticanus, Codex \aleph or S, the Sinaiticus, and Codex A, or Alexandrinus, thereby offering a combination of the best sources available. The work of the editor has been done with painstaking and scientific care and exhibits a scholarship which will bear comparison with that of the foremost workers in the field. The name of Alfred Rahlfs is a guarantee of this statement, and the Stuttgart Septuagint represents the culmination of his life-work. On April 1, 1935, he signed the preface, and on April 8 he died. His name will always be connected with the chapter on Septuagint research; for since the death of Lagarde, his teacher, he was the foremost German scholar in this field. And the Stuttgart Septuagint will be the visible monument of his life-work, which will keep his name alive in the field of theology and in the Church for decades, if not longer.

As the name of Rahlfs guarantees a production of superior merit from the standpoint of collating and editing, so the name of the institution that had the courage to publish the two-volume edition in this splendid form guarantees an excellent production so far as print and mechanical details are concerned. The type, both in the text proper and in the footnotes, is clear; the paper is strong and smooth, but not glossy; the binding leaves nothing to be desired. And the price of twelve marks for the two bound volumes is surely most reasonable, especially in view of the nature of the work. The Stuttgart Septuagint enables every pastor and every student of theology to devote himself to this great field of theological study. It is true that the value of the Septuagint in the Lutheran Church does not equal that of the Hebrew Old Testament or the Greek New Testament, without which any kind of real study in the text of the Scriptures is impossible. And yet the Septuagint is so closely connected

with the history of missions in the Church and offers such enormous possibilities in the field of exegesis and textual criticism that a proper appreciation of these fields of study is not possible without this version. The study of the Old Testament without the Septuagint is hardly to be thought of, and that of the New Testament will gain immensely by the constant reference to the many direct and indirect Septuagint quotations. The writers of the New Testament constantly drew upon its vocabulary and its world of ideas, and thus the treasures of a large part of the Septuagint have become the property of the New Testament Church. Let us hope that the time will soon come when the question proposed in the caption of this short discussion will receive a general positive answer; for this will certainly redound in blessings for our Church, both in its evangelistic work and in its inner growth.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Der Schriftgrund für die Lehre von der satisfactio vicaria.

(Schluß.)

11. Christus hat die Handschrift getilgt.

Kol. 2, 14 (13b—15): Nachdem er uns alle Übertretungen geschenkt hat, nachdem er ausgelöscht hat die Handschrift, die wider uns war, die durch ihre Sühnungen uns entgegen war, und hat sie aus der Mitte getan dadurch, daß er sie ans Kreuz nagelte, hat er, nachdem er die Fürstentümer und die Obrigkeiten ausgezogen hat, zur Schau gestellt öffentlich, sie zum Triumph machend durch dasselbe.

In dem Passus, der unmittelbar vor diesen Versen steht, hatte Paulus in der zweiten Person geredet, um den Kolossern sonderlich die Bedeutung und den Wert der Taufe deutlich vor die Augen zu führen. In dem uns vorliegenden Satz schließt der Apostel sich mit ein, um die Segnungen, die auch er mit erfahren hat, besonders hervorzuheben und zu betonen.

Subjekt des Satzes ist offenbar Gott, da von ihm unmittelbar vorher gesagt wird, daß er die Christen mit Christo lebendig gemacht hat. Gott hat uns alle Übertretungen geschenkt, sie in Christo, um Christi willen, erlassen, vergeben. In dem Verbum *χαρισάμενος* liegt, wie immer, die Tatsache der freien Gnadengabe Gottes in Christo, die Wahrheit von der einmaligen und völlig hinreichenden Erlösung und Versöhnung, vermöge deren Gott der sündigen Welt die Gesamtschuld erlassen und ihr seine vergebende Gnade wieder zugewandt hat, wie Thomafius schreibt.

Mit diesem Gedanken steht parallel und zugleich auch erklärend die nächste Aussage: nachdem er ausgelöscht hat die Hand-

schrift, die wider uns war, die wider uns lautete, die uns verklagte und verdamnte. Das Nomen χειρόγραφον heißt wörtlich eine handschriftliche Urkunde, wodurch sich ein Mensch verpflichtet, ein Schuldbrief, hier klar von dem Moralgesez, weil es weiter heißt, daß diese Handschrift durch ihre Satzungen, durch ihre einzelnen Gebote, uns entgegen war. Das Gesez Gottes, der Schuldbrief, war uns entgegen, konstatierte unsere Schuld, weil es uns in den einzelnen Geboten immer wieder nachwies und ausführte, daß wir diese übertreten hatten.

Dieser Schuldbrief aber ist nun ausgelöscht, und zwar damit, daß Gott selbst die Handschrift aus der Mitte getan, sie gänzlich getilgt hat, so daß sie nicht mehr zwischen uns und Gott stehen kann. Das hat Gott dadurch getan, daß er die Handschrift an das Kreuz genagelt hat. Der Wechsel vom Aorist zum Perfektum ist bezeichnend, denn dies bedeutet den immerwährenden Charakter der hierdurch geschehenen Veränderung. Als Christus gekreuzigt wurde, hat Gott selbst das Gesez an das Kreuz genagelt. Somit bezeichnet die Annagelung an das Kreuz die gänzliche Außerkraftsezung des Gesezes. Und man kann hier mit Bahn zwei Gedanken verbinden, das Abtun der Schuld, die durch die Übertretung des Gesezes entstanden war, und die Außerkraftsezung des Gesezes selbst. Alles dies hat die stellvertretende Genugtuung des Heilandes bewirkt.

Im weiteren gibt der Apostel an, was die Folge dieser Stellvertretung ist. Gott hat die Fürstentümer und Gewaltigen ihrer Macht und Gewalt beraubt und sie zur Schau gestellt öffentlich als gänzlich Besiegte, als überwundene und aller Kraft beraubte Feinde. Infolgedessen ist es allen Gläubigen möglich, aller Feinde zu spotten und über sie zu triumphieren. Das ist die selige Frucht des Leidens und des Todes Christi.

12. Christus hat uns von dem Fluch der Verdamnis erlöst.

Gal. 3, 13: Christus hat uns losgekauft vom Fluch des Gesezes, da er für uns ein Fluch ward (denn es steht geschrieben: „Verflucht ist jeder, der am Holz hängt“).

Der Zusammenhang, in dem diese Worte stehen, ist der folgende. Der Apostel hatte bestimmt gesagt, daß alle, die aus des Gesezes Werken sind, unter dem Fluch sind. Und dabei hatte er den Gedanken zurückgewiesen, daß irgend jemand durch das Gesez vor Gott gerecht werden könne. Dies muß von jedem zugestanden werden, der die Unmöglichkeit der Rechtfertigung aus den Werken erkannt hat. Dazu kommt aber als Hauptsache, daß die Schrift ausdrücklich bezeugt: Der Gerechte wird durch den Glauben leben. Es besteht demnach eine unüberbrückbare Kluft zwischen Gesez und Evangelium, zwischen Werken und Glauben.

Aus diesem Grunde aber gibt es nur eine Möglichkeit der Rettung für die ganze Menschheit, nämlich die Erlösung durch die stellver-

tretende Genugtuung Christi. Davon schreibt der Apostel: Christus hat uns losgekauft vom Fluch des Gesetzes. Paulus bedient sich des Verbums *ἐξαγοράζειν*, das klar und deutlich die volle Zahlung des Lösegeldes ausdrückt. "The figure of a ransom which this word conveys is doubly appropriate in this connection. Men needed a ransom; for the Law had left them prisoners under the sentence of death, and Christ had Himself to pay the price. He had to become a man like His brethren save in sin and to endure the penalty denounced on malefactors and hang on the accursed cross, as if He had been guilty like them." (Resball, in *Expositor's Greek Testament*.) Vgl. Kap. 4, 5; 1 Kor. 6, 20; Eph. 1, 7; 2 Petr. 2, 1.

Wie diese Loskaufung, diese Erlösung, zustande kam, sagt der Apostel in den Worten: da er für uns ein Fluch ward. Der ganze Satz, insbesondere der Ausdruck *ὡς ἡμῶν*, betont die Tatsache, daß Christi Erlösungstod ein stellvertretender war, daß Christus an unserer Statt sich dem Fluche unterstellt hat. Er ward ein Fluch für uns, er nahm die Verfluchung an, als ob sie ihm persönlich gälte, weil er sich eben ganz und gar mit dem menschlichen Geschlecht identifizierte, unsere Stelle einnahm. Dies wird dadurch noch verstärkt, daß *κατάρα* als abstractum pro concreto gebraucht wird, mit betonender Wirkung. Vgl. 2 Kor. 5, 21. Der Apostel sagt hier klar und unmißverständlich aus, daß es sich bei Christi Kreuzestod um eine Übertragung der Fluchwirkung von denen, die sie eigentlich erfahren sollten, auf den schuldlosen Erlöser handelt.

Um seine Aussage zu erhärten, zitiert der Apostel Deut. 21, 23 frei nach den LXX mit Auslassung des *ὡς θεοῦ*. Die neue Offenbarung der Barmherzigkeit Gottes in Christo hat das frühere Verdammungsurteil des Gesetzes aufgehoben, sonderlich soweit wir alle in Betracht kommen. „In Christi freiwillig übernommenem Kreuzestode erblickt also Paulus den Akt, wodurch der vom Gesetz ausgehende Fluch sich vollständig auswirkt und in seiner schädigenden Wirkung für die Menschheit sein Ziel erreicht hat.“ (Böckler im Strack-Böcklerschen Kommentar.) Und die selige Folge dieser Stellvertretung gibt der Apostel im nächsten Kapitel in den herrlichen Worten an: „damit er die, so unter dem Gesetz waren, erlösete, daß wir die Kinderschaft empfangen“, Gal. 4, 5.

1 Thess. 1, 10: Und [sehnlich] zu erwarten seinen Sohn aus den Himmeln, welchen er auferweckt hat von den Toten, Jesum, der uns losreißt vom fünftigen Zorn.

In B. 9 erinnert der Apostel die Thessalonicher daran, daß sie durch die Predigt des Evangeliums gewonnen worden sind, so daß sie sich bekehrt haben von den Götzen hinweg zu Gott, zu dienen dem Lebendigen und wahren Gott. Weil die Christen zu Thessalonich der Mehrzahl nach aus dem Heidentum gewonnen waren, betont Paulus die Tatsache, daß sie damit den toten Götzen gänzlich entsagt haben. Ihr ganzes Leben

ist jetzt ein steter Gottesdienst, ein Leben in und mit dem Lebendigen und wahren Gott.

Ein charakteristisches Merkmal aber dieses neuen Lebens und Wesens ist dies, daß die Gläubigen mit sehnsüchtiger Erwartung anschauen (ἀναμένειν nur hier im Neuen Testament) nach dem Kommen des Sohnes Gottes aus den Himmeln. Wie oft im Neuen Testament, so steht auch hier der Plural οὐδὲν, um den Ort der Seligen zu bezeichnen, wo der auferstandene Gottessohn Jesus jetzt seinen Thron zur Rechten des Vaters hat, Kol. 3, 1 ff.; Hebr. 4, 14; 8, 1. Eben diesen Jesus hat Gott auferweckt von den Toten; er hat seinen Sohn, der in eigener Kraftvollkommenheit sein Leben wiedernehmen konnte, ins Leben zurückgerufen, um damit anzuzeigen, daß er das Sühnopfer des Heilandes voll und ganz angenommen hat.

Und nun kommt die wunderbare Aussage, daß eben dieser Jesus es ist, der uns losreißt und erlöst von dem zukünftigen Zorn. Das Partizip ὡςκειν ist gewissermaßen im substantivischen Sinn gebraucht, so daß es gleichbedeutend ist mit „Erlöser“. Der Name Jesus deutet an, daß die Menschheit des Erlösers vorzugsweise, stark, hervorgehoben wird, weil von seiner Wiederkunft die Rede ist, die ja fast regelmäßig mit Betonung seiner menschlichen Natur verbunden ist. Jesus, derselbe, der wiederkommen wird, zu richten die Lebendigen und die Toten, ist derjenige, der uns wegreißt, losreißt, erlöst von dem künftigen Zorn. Dieser Zorn Gottes über den Abfall, über die Sünde der Menschheit, sollte gerechterweise auch uns treffen, die wir von Natur in gleicher Verdammnis stecken. Aber aus dieser drohenden Verdammnis hat uns der Heiland erlöst. Seine Stellvertretung hat auch dies zustande gebracht, hat uns sichergestellt für alle Ewigkeit.

1 Theff. 5, 9, 10: Denn nicht hat uns Gott gesetzt zum Zorn, sondern zur Erwerbung des Heils durch unsern Herrn Jesus Christum, der für uns gestorben ist, auf daß, ob wir wachen oder ob wir schlafen, wir zusammen mit ihm leben.

Der Hauptgedanke des Zusammenhanges ist angegeben in den Worten des Apostels: „Denn ihr alle seid Söhne des Lichts und Söhne des Tages; wir sind nicht von der Nacht oder Finsternis.“ Er redet von dem neuen geistlichen Leben in seinen Bezeugungen. Weil alle Gläubigen in der Gemeinschaft mit ihrem himmlischen Vater und ihrem Heiland leben, wollen sie in rechter Nüchternheit den Panzer des Glaubens und der Liebe sowie den Helm der Heilshoffnung gebrauchen.

Nun knüpft der Apostel an mit γὰρ, um mit der Angabe des Grundes zugleich den Inhalt der christlichen Hoffnung darzulegen: Nicht hat uns Gott gesetzt zum Zorn. Der Zorn des gerechten Gottes, den auch wir nach unserm natürlichen Wesen und Leben verdient haben, ist nicht mehr für uns da; wir sind nicht mehr zu diesem Zorn gesetzt; wir sehen uns nicht mehr genötigt, diesen Zorn zu fürchten.

Jorn, Tod und Verdamnis haben ihre Schreden für uns und alle, die sich auf die Seligkeit verlassen, die in Jesu Christo ist, verloren. Zweck und Ziel des Lebens der Gläubigen ist nun nicht mehr die ewige Verdammnis, sondern ihr ganzes Sinnen und Trachten ist darauf gerichtet, das durch Jesum Christum erworbene Heil zu besitzen, es sich anzueignen. Mit Absicht gebraucht der Apostel das Nomen *ἀποβολή*, weil er betonen will, daß der Glaube allerdings eine Tätigkeit auf seiten des Menschen bedeutet, wenn er auch kein verdienstliches Tun sein kann, da nicht die Tätigkeit des Glaubens an sich, sondern das Objekt der Tätigkeit die Seligkeit bringt.

Dies wird noch besonders hervorgehoben durch den Relativsatz *der für uns gestorben ist*. Der Ausdruck *ὅτι ἡμῶν* erhebt die Tatsache des vollkommenen, stellvertretenden Verdienstes Christi wieder über allen Zweifel. Sein Tod war ein Tod an unserer Statt. Er hat erduldet, was wir hätten erdulden sollen; er ist gestorben, um uns das Leben zu bringen. Sind wir mit dieser Versicherung ausgerüstet, dann kann es uns nichts mehr ausmachen, ob wir wachen oder schlafen, ob wir noch weiter leben oder durch den Tod abgerufen werden. Eine Versicherung haben wir, nämlich daß wir zusammen mit ihm leben. Durch seinen Tod ist uns das Leben in und mit ihm verbürgt, und dies Leben ist unser voller Besitz. Vgl. Röm. 14, 8. Weil wir durch Christi Stellvertretung von der ewigen Verdammnis erlöst sind, haben wir die selige Gewißheit, daß wir in ihm das Leben haben, hier zeitlich und dort ewiglich.

R. E. R.

Outlines on the Eisenach Epistle Selections.

Second Sunday in Advent.

2 PET. 1, 3—11.

Peter had nearly reached the end of his career, 2 Pet. 1, 14. Sees much in the world that disturbs him. Prevalence of false teaching, 2, 1. General corruption of society, vv. 10—12. Greater apostasy in days to come, vv. 2, 20—22. Inspired by the Holy Ghost, 1, 21, he writes to his beloved Christians, of whom he says that they had obtained like precious faith with him, 1, 1, and issues to them a call to holiness, progressive holiness, and an admonition to stand by the Scriptures as the sure Word of Prophecy.

We are living in similar times. Much false teaching. Many sects. Some of them still retain part of Christian doctrine, while others, like Christian Scientists, merely retain name. Sad social conditions in world to-day. Lowering of moral standards in our country. Much crime, especially among young people. Divorce, drunkenness, dishonesty. World lieth in wickedness." Christians live in this wicked world. Constant danger of contamination. Call to holiness needed always, needed especially now. A call to reconsecration, a call to holiness, always in place. Therefore:—

A Call to Holiness.

1. *The basis for such a call.*
2. *The results the call is to obtain.*

1.

a. Context, 2 Pet. 1, 2. Here apostle prays for the Christians to whom he writes. Does not pray for prosperity for them, not for more honor, not for a better ranking in community, but for spiritual things, that grace and peace may be multiplied unto them. But he does not merely pray for increased holiness for those to whom his letter is addressed. He issues call to holiness, urges believers to make every effort to grow in sanctification, vv. 3, 4.

b. Peter bases his call to holiness on the call of God issued to them through the Gospel, v. 3. Same truth stated 1 Thess. 2, 12. Peter reminds Christians that everything they have in spiritual matters is a gift, pure and simple, from the Lord, v. 3a; cf. 2 Tim. 1, 9. This was true in days of apostle. Is true to-day. Is true in our own case. God's grace permitted us to be born in Christian homes. God's grace called us through the water of Baptism. God's grace called us in school, in confirmation instruction, in the church services. God called us to faith though He saw no merit or worthiness in us.

c. Peter's call to holiness, however, also based upon the exceedingly great and precious promises of God, v. 4a. The greatest promise of God is the promise of eternal life, John 3, 16; 1 John 2, 25. This promise and other promises of God strengthen our faith, remind us of the fact that we are new creatures in Christ Jesus, that we are really partakers of the divine nature, v. 4b. The wonderful promises of God do not only give us power to live unto Christ, to do that which is right, but also to fight sin, warding off that which is evil, v. 4c. Gratitude for the goodness of God, His creation, redemption, and sanctification, should move us to lead a better, a holier, a more God-pleasing life.

d. What is the situation in the average congregation? Many members are members of long standing. Many Christians nearly a lifetime. Many go to church more or less regularly. Many attend Holy Communion at least periodically. Still, how little actual increase in sanctification noticeable in so many, many members! Same old negligence in church attendance year after year. So often we see no improvement in giving. Same amount year after year in spite of added blessings, both spiritual and material. So often no improvement as to willingness to serve, in Sunday-school, choir, voters' assembly, societies. Lethargy and indifference regarding work of Kingdom, work of missions, is often appalling. Needed indeed the apostles' call to godliness, call to grow in grace, to practise one Christian virtue after the other. Second half of text shows just what the call to holiness, based upon call of God and His wonderful promises, should accomplish in life of individual Christian and in life of congregation.

2.

a. Vv. 5—7. Apostle describes growth and expansion of Christian life of sanctification as a gradual, but steady progress. Peter knows that Christians must begin in the kindergarten of the school of God; but he does expect them to advance from grade to grade, to grow. Parents are very eager to have their children advance step by step. Heavenly Father just as anxious to see us advance, to grow in holiness. Peter begins with faith. Peter knows that faith worketh by love, knows that faith is the root from which all virtues and all good works proceed, Rom. 14, 23b; Gal. 5, 6b; Jas. 2, 17. Where faith is, faith based upon Word, nourished by means of grace, frequent attendance at Lord's Table, there will be virtue. "Add to your faith virtue," v. 5. Virtue means here as much as manly courage, the attitude of mind which will seek to please God in all things, even in face of difficulties and hindrances.

b. V. 5c. Knowledge an additional virtue. Here not knowledge of God, not in particular knowledge of salvation, but rather the knowledge of that which pleases God. Christian insight, Christian discernment, Christian circumspection. A Christian, enlightened by God, will look at things altogether differently from a worldling. A Christian looks at matters in the light of eternity.

c. V. 6. Temperance is another Christian virtue. This temperance is not merely moderate use of food and drink. Such temperance must of course be urged just in this post-Prohibition age, when drinking to excess has become fashionable, when even women frequent taverns and cocktail bars in large numbers. Temperance here urged goes much farther — temperance in all things. Temperance caused not by fear, fear of wrecked health, fear of punishment, but a deliberate ruling over body and mind and all their faculties and desires. Since this must be done constantly because of constant temptation, the apostle urges patience as another virtue. — And this whole serious striving after greater perfection in the virtues mentioned will result in godliness.

d. V. 7. The highest evidence of true godliness is love, love of the brethren, fellow-members of the church, love also of mankind in general, love of the lowly, love even of the enemy. Even among so-called Christians there is a sad lack of such love. Examples.

e. V. 8. Where these virtues exist, there can be no barrenness, no unfruitfulness. Where there is faith, there is sanctification, good works, growth, and life. Just a natural consequence. But where, v. 9, there are no virtues, there is no growing in grace; there is danger that such a person is spiritually blind, does not see things in light of heaven, yea, has forgotten what heavenly gifts he received in conversion, and is again on broad road of world. Serious matter. Examine yourself. Are you one of those barren trees? There is always danger

of reverting to unfruitfulness, especially if one cuts himself off from means of grace.

f. Therefore final appeal of apostle, vv. 10, 11. "Make sure your election." Election is sure on part of God, 1 Pet. 1, 5; John 10, 27-30. But it would be height of folly for Christian to argue that he can live just as he chooses in the world. Elect walk in paths of sanctification, Eph. 1, 4. When a Christian observes in own heart increased holiness, more love, greater liberality in giving, more sanctification, he is happy, strengthened in faith. Actually sees the gates of heaven open. —Whole matter important. Important to God. Important to Church. Important to individual. Strive therefore to grow, grow in grace and good works.

E. L. ROSCHKE.

Third Sunday in Advent.

2 TIM. 4, 5-8.

A part of this text of Holy Writ has frequently been taken as a basis for a funeral sermon. — And, tell me, is it not a glorious thing to be able at the close of a Christian's life to testify of such a Christian: He has fought a good fight, he has finished the course, he has kept the faith? Certainly, that is a triumphant paean of victory. Let me ask you, Could this be said of you when your funeral sermon will be preached? Would this text be applicable to you? Could we then say of you, He (or she) has fought a good fight, has finished the course, has kept the faith? I hope that every one of you will say, God grant that all this may be said of me when I have finished my course on earth!

In order to judge intelligently whether these words could properly be applied to us, let us to-day give attention to their meaning. We shall center our attention upon these pivotal words of our text: —

"I have Fought a Good Fight."

1. Who may truthfully say this?

a. Only those who have what Paul fought for — true faith.
1. Paul was a converted believer, 1 Tim. 1, 15, 16. 2. Without this faith there is nothing to fight for, Heb. 11, 6; Mark 16, 16; Acts 16, 31; 10, 43.

b. Only those who like Paul fight to keep this faith to the end, v. 7c; Rev. 2, 10b. 1. By watchfulness, v. 5a; Matt. 25, 13; 26, 41. 2. By enduring affliction, v. 5b; Acts 14, 22b; Heb. 11, 36-38; 12, 6-8. 3. By resisting the devil, 2 Cor. 12, 7; Eph. 6, 16; the world, Acts 16, 19-24; John 15, 18; the flesh, 1 Cor. 9, 26, 27; Gal. 5, 17. (Application.)

2. Of what glorious blessings is such a one assured?

a. Even for the present he is blessed beyond words. Just compare with these words of our text the words of unbelievers at the end of

their lives. Some have died cursing every one and have ended in despair. Saul, Judas, Ahithophel, Abimelech (Judg. 9, 53. 54), Julian the Apostate. On the other hand, Paul in text. Luther's last words.

b. But there is even a greater blessedness in store for them, v. 8. A crown of righteousness. Cf. 1 Pet. 1, 3. 4; 4, 13; Matt. 5, 12; 25, 34; Rom. 8, 18; Phil. 3, 21.

c. This glory and these rewards and blessings will be given not only to such great teachers of the Church as Paul or Timothy, but, according to our text, "unto all them also that love His appearing"; every humble Christian is to receive them. We also may joyfully say: Phil. 3, 8—10 and 1, 23. Hymn 559, 1. 5. 8. M. S. SOMMER.

Fourth Sunday in Advent.

1 JOHN 1, 1—4.

"Joy to the world, the Lord is come!" (Hymn 158, 1.) The Christian religion, contrary to the opinion of the world, is a religion of great joy. Says Jesus: "These things have I spoken unto you that My joy might remain in you and that your joy might be full," John 15, 11. Says Paul: "The kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost," Rom. 14, 17. In our text John says: "And these things write we unto you that your joy may be full." (Whether we read *your* joy or, according to other manuscripts, *our* joy, the fact remains that the Gospel-message is to bring joy to the hearts of men.) Therefore, "let the children of Zion be joyful in their King," Ps. 149, 2. Cp. Phil. 4, 4.

Of all this we are reminded on this Sunday as we stand on the threshold of another Christmas season, during which the message concerning the Word of Life shall fill our hearts and lives with joy. Let us therefore consider:—

John's Threefold Statement Concerning the Word of Life Fills Our Hearts with Joy.

1. *The Word of Life was manifested.*

a. The need of life. When sin entered the world, life went out, and death came in, Gen. 2, 17; 3, 1 ff.; Rom. 4, 12.

b. God provided life. God promised to send the Savior that life might be given to men who were dead in trespasses and sins, Gen. 3, 15. This Savior is the only-begotten Son of God, v. 1; John 1, 1—3. The promise of God was fulfilled by the advent of Jesus. "The Word was made flesh," John 1, 14; Luke 2, 11. Jesus is the Word of Life, v. 1; John 1, 4; 6, 33—35; 11, 25; Rom. 5, 17. The entire visible sojourn of the Savior here on earth was a *manifestation* of the Word of Life. The angel's message was a message of "good tidings of great

joy." What joy the apostles who saw and heard and handled the Word of Life and believed must have experienced!

The Word of Life was manifested, the evidence is sufficient; but "how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher?" Rom. 10, 14. Therefore —

2. *The Word of Life is declared, vv. 2, 3.*

a. Those who declare the Word of Life are reliable witnesses, vv. 1—3. They have been with Jesus, Acts 4, 13, heard Him preach, saw Him perform His miracles, handled Him, John 20, 24—29; saw His glory, John 1, 14; Matt. 17, 1—5; saw Him at various times after His resurrection, John 20, 21; Luke 24.

b. The apostles were sent as witnesses to the sinful world, Acts 1, 8. They were to be teachers whose inspired utterances and writings were to declare the Word of Life to a world dead in trespasses and sins, v. 2; Matt. 10, 1—20; 1 Cor. 2, 7—13; Gal. 1, 1, 6—12; Eph. 2, 20.

This witness-bearing is to continue unto the end of days. To the Church the Lord gave the command to preach the Gospel in all the world, Matt. 28, 18—20, even those truths which the apostles taught, Gal. 1, 6—9; 2 Tim. 2, 2; 4, 1—5; Rev. 22, 18, 19; Luke 10, 16.

What is the purpose of the declaration? Why can we truly sing, "Joy to the world!"? V. 3 gives the answer. It tells us the blessed fact that —

3. *The Word of Life brings about fellowship.*

The purpose of the apostolic declaration of the Word of Life is *fellowship*: fellowship with the apostles and fellowship with the Father and His Son, Jesus Christ, v. 3.

a. *Fellowship with the apostles.* This is the fellowship of believers. Christ prayed: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word, *that they all may be one*," John 17, 20, 21a. In these words Christ also says how the fellowship of believers is brought about, namely, *through the Word that is preached*. Having been brought to faith, believers are united in faith with all who have faith and together share the blessings of the Word of Life. Hence the spiritual *unity* of the Church. The words of Christ John 17, 21 are not to be misinterpreted to mean an *outward* union, although Scripture teaches even that to be the *ideal*, 1 Cor. 1, 10.

b. Through the declaration of the Word of Life men are called into the fellowship of the apostles and that of all believers by being called to the greater *fellowship with the Father and His Son*, Jesus Christ, v. 3; 1 Cor. 1, 9. Not a mere outward fellowship with the saints assures us our fellowship with the Father and the Son; but our inner fellowship with the saints, through faith, is a result of our fellowship with the Father and the Son and an indication of our possession of it.

This fellowship with the Father and the Son is the dwelling of God in the believers, 1 Cor. 3, 16; John 14, 23; being partakers of the divine nature (not of God's essence, but of God's holiness), 2 Pet. 1, 4; being the blessed sons of God, John 1, 12; Rom. 8, 15—17; having communion with God through prayer, John 15, 7; Gen. 32. 24 f.; being sanctified by the Spirit unto holiness of life, Rom. 8, 5—14; being members of God's holy temple, Eph. 2, 19—22, and of His body, which is the Church, 1 Cor. 12, 27; Col. 1, 18.

"And these things write we unto you that your joy may be full," v. 4. Where death reigned, life now reigns; where sin reigned unto death, now grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ, our Lord, Rom. 5, 17. 21. Hymn 152, 1. J. H. C. FRITZ.

Christmas Day.

1 JOHN 3, 1—5.

"Behold what manner of love," etc. These are words of amazement. The thought suggested in the previous verse; again in 5, 1. It is such a magnificent thought that the apostle now dwells upon it. What is behind it? the cause of it? It is God's love. God's love has been given to us. Can you conceive it? Can you believe it? Here is the evidence. — It is a true Christmas text. Christmas is the festival of love, bringing us the greatest manifestation of God's love. Here the apostle shows what the incarnation of God's Son, God's gift of love, means to us. — It is all so amazing that we, too, must exclaim with the apostle:—

"Behold what Manner of Love the Father hath Bestowed upon Us!"

This love has made us—

1. *The sons of God;* 2. *The heirs of God;* 3. *The followers of God.*

1.

"That we should be called the sons of God." (Many codices add: "And we are"; as a matter of fact, that is the meaning; a mere name with no meaning would give John no cause for this eulogy. Augustine: „*Nam qui vocantur et non sunt, quid illis prodest nomen, ubi res non est?*" Besides, the next verse states it plainly.) To appreciate this, note the "now," v. 2. It was not always thus. We were sinners, rebels as such, sons of the devil, v. 4, children of wrath; helpless, for so we were born, and spiritual rebirth is as impossible to man as physical rebirth.

But God's love has remade us. We are now born of God, born a second time. That has been accomplished through the incarnation of the Son of God; He was manifested to take away our sin, v. 5; by

His active (Gal. 4, 5) and passive obedience (1 John 1, 7; Gal. 3, 13). We now become the sons of God through faith in Christ, receiving the adoption through regeneration, Gal. 3, 26; John 1, 12.

What manner of love — the sons of God! What dignity! What assurance!

2.

We are the sons of God; and if children, then heirs, Rom. 8, 17; Gal. 4, 7; but "it doth not yet appear what we shall be," 1 John 3, 2. Christians bear no visible marks of this inheritance. Hence the world regards their claim of sonship as arrogance and treats Christians accordingly. Our own heart feels disappointed, and our reason, comparing actual experience in life with this claim, protests and doubts. And the devil encourages such doubts and prompts return to the old flesh-pots.

Our inheritance is a hope, v. 3. We shall be like Him; we shall see Him as He is. That is a concise description of heaven: All sin abolished, and with it all the results of sin; the divine image restored, and with it all the faculties impaired or totally lost through sin; and an eternity of life in the presence of God and our Savior, a full understanding and appreciation of His ways, and full enjoyment of communion with Him. — Only a hope, but a sure hope; "we know," v. 2. And it is the Child born in Bethlehem who has purchased for us this sure hope.

What manner of love! To us such glory and bliss! Who would give more than a passing thought to the vicissitudes of life with such a hope in view?

3.

We are the sons of God; that involves certain consequences, v. 3. Note that the apostle does not designate this as a duty and an obligation, but as a natural result. Children partake of the nature and character of their parents; children of God partake of His nature and character. Whoever lacks that similarity is no son. And every child of God is by nature a follower of God and of Christ.

Not by his own nature; he is wicked as all others. But "what manner of love!" Being born again, Christians are endowed with a new nature, which is of God. Jesus, born in Bethlehem, has taken away our sins; He has freed us, not only of the guilt and punishment, but also of the domination of sin. He who has become a child of God through faith is pure, v. 3; his sins are forgiven; and he now purifies himself, crucifies the Old Adam, strives to run the way of God's commandments; and he can do so by virtue of God-given powers, not perfectly, but ever better.

What manner of love! Regard it penitently, gratefully, adoringly; and make sure that you appropriate it. THEO. HOYER.

Second Christmas Day.

HEB. 1, 1—6.

Reference to the second advent of Christ is justified by the text and by the festival season terminating with Christmas. As the prophets and kings desired to see the coming of Christ into the world, Luke 10, 24, so we who believe look forward in sure hope to the joy to come, v. 6a (when He shall have again brought in the First-begotten into the world). But the future bliss is based on the first appearance of Christ, the Father's first bringing in of the First-begotten. Thus the future and the past meet in the present to fill us with unspeakable joy to-day.

The First Bringing In of the First-Begotten.

It offers joy to the world; for—

1. *The Lord is come;*
2. *Christ, the Savior, is born.**

1.

a. The Lord is come. Note the Person brought in. 1. His divine essence, v. 3a. He is the effulgence of God's glory (Luther: *efflux*) and the exact image, expression, precise reproduction, the very character, of God's essence, John 12, 45; 14, 9. Man with his limited mind cannot describe or understand the great I AM. 2. His divine attributes: v. 5, eternal; v. 3, divine power. 3. His divine relation to the Father: vv. 2, 5, the Son of God; v. 6, the First-begotten. 4. His divine works: creation, v. 2; John 1, 1—14; preservation, v. 3; government, vv. 3, 4; judging the quick and the dead, v. 6. 5. His divine honor and glory, compared with prophets, v. 1, angels, vv. 4, 6, denoting not merely superiority, but supremacy. 6. Expressly called God, v. 8; John 20, 28; 1 John 5, 20; Rom. 9, 5; Jer. 23, 6; Ps. 45, 7, 8. — Indeed, the Lord is come!

b. How did the Father bring in the First-begotten? Where may He be found? Gal. 4, 4; Luke 1 and 2; "the Lord," Luke 2, 11; Is. 7, 14; 9, 6; 1 Tim. 3, 16; John 1, 14. In statements bold, but proved, in words of life majestically rolling, the text bears the Son of Man, who is the Son of God, through from the manger to His sitting on the right hand of the Majesty on high, from glory to shame and again to glory, and thus shows that the Lord is come.

c. Joy to the world! Luke 2, 10. God ushered in His Son for the joy of the world. But is the joy universal? How dark and cheerless so many hearts at Christmas! How foolish of proud man to be offended at the poverty and humility of the Son of God and to de-

* In a German sermon the parts may be announced in the words of the German hymnal No. 29, 1. 2.

prive himself through unbelief of the joy of greeting and worshipping the incarnate God! Sin against the First Table: Is. 42, 8; Matt. 4, 10; John 5, 23. Yet we ourselves would flee in fear and guilt from the brightness of His glory and from the express image of His Person or despise in pride the Virgin Mary's Son if this bringing in would be a judgment of the righteous God upon man. But: John 3, 16. Faith sings: Christ, the *Savior*, is born.

2.

a. V. 3. The bringing in of the First-begotten was God's official presentation and introduction of the Savior. The Son of God is the Christ, the Anointed One, anointed to be 1. our Prophet, vv. 1, 2a; Heb. 2, 1; Deut. 18, 15; Matt. 17, 5; John 1, 18; Luke 10, 16; 2. our Priest, v. 3; Heb. 7, 26, 27; 9, 12, 14, 26; 1 Pet. 2, 24; Is. 53; 3. our King, vv. 6, 2; Matt. 21, 5; 2 Tim. 4, 18. Indeed, Christ, the *Savior*, is born.

b. Now let us follow up the comparative "better," v. 4, throughout this epistle to see what God has wrought through Christ for us: 7, 19; 8, 6; 9, 11, 23; 10, 34; 11, 16, 35, 40; 12, 24. Christ, the *Savior*, is born!

c. Therefore joy to the world, the sinful, helpless, fallen race of man. Faith required, John 3, 16; Heb. 2, 1. — Since every heart is to prepare Him room, shall we whose souls are lighted etc., Hymn 474, 3.

G. H. SMUKAL.

Sunday after Christmas.

2 COR. 5, 1—10.

We are hastening to the end of the year; soon 1936 will give place to 1937. Time flies, and its flight reminds us of the fact that the end of our earthly life is ever drawing nearer and with it the day when our bodies must be laid in the dark and somber grave. However, the green Christmas-tree under which we have gathered for worship, this symbol of life and immortality, brings comfort to our hearts as we think of death and the end of our earthly days; for it speaks to us of Him who came into the flesh to gain for us life and immortality. It tells us, as does to-day's epistle, of—

The Glorious Exchange of Dwellings that Awaits Us.

Our text assures us that—

1. *We are to exchange our earthly tent-dwelling for a heavenly home; and it brings home to us the fact that*
2. *The thought of this wonderful exchange should deeply affect us.*

1.

Our present dwelling; that is, the present dwelling of our soul, is earthly, v. 1, of this earth. And it is a flimsy, temporary habitation, comparable to a tent. It is easily dissolved, v. 1, torn down and destroyed. A gust of wind may blow over a tent and make it uninhabitable; so the slightest cause may destroy the body in which we now live; a breath of air, an invisible germ, the sting of an insect may bring about the collapse of the tent in which our soul now lives.

For this reason our present dwelling is most unsatisfactory, v. 2; we groan while occupying it, being burdened by its inconveniences, limitations, and uncertainties, by the downright hardships its occupancy entails in the way of pain, weakness, and illness.

b. This all fills the soul of the believer with the desire to be "absent from the body," v. 8, which is so unsatisfactory as a dwelling. However, this removal is connected with much that is unpleasant and with many undesirable circumstances. The desired removal is usually connected with violence. Who can therefore blame the believer for wishing, as did Paul, not for an "unclothing," but to be "clothed upon," v. 4; that is, for a sudden transmutation of the body, as Elijah experienced, and as will be the happy lot of those who remain till Christ's coming to Judgment, 1 Cor. 15, 51. 52?

c. But though the removal from the earthly body is connected with many undesirable circumstances, what a glorious change of habitation it will be for the soul of the believer! The soul will exchange the earthly, insecure, tottering tent for a heavenly, firm dwelling, — a real home, secure and permanent, v. 1.

All the inconveniences, shortcomings, and limitations of the earthly tent-dwelling will be past. Of the joy, satisfaction, and glory that will be ours, the believers, in this new dwelling of our soul we can of course have no proper conception; for after we have thought of all that is good and desirable and glorious, we shall be still far, far from having realized the actual bliss awaiting us when our soul will have entered its eternal home. The earth will have been exchanged for heaven, the company of sinners for that of the angels; and, above all, we shall be with God, our eternal Father and loving Savior, the Source of all real happiness and true satisfaction.

And while the removal from the earthly body was connected with much that was painful, the entrance of the soul into its heavenly dwelling and its reception at the gates of the eternal homeland will have for it only that which is desirable and gratifying. God Himself will receive the soul that has entered its eternal dwelling into His heavenly Jerusalem with words of sweetest welcome and assure the believer of the blessed fact that he shall ever be with Him, v. 8.

2.

The thought of this wonderful exchange of dwellings should deeply affect us believers.

a. First of all, it should lead us to earnest heart-searchings, since this exchange of dwellings involves our appearance before the judgment-seat of Christ, v. 10. We should not neglect honestly to examine our hearts as to whether our soul, now living in its earthly tabernacle, is taking the proper attitude toward Christ, its Savior. We should ask ourselves, Are we walking by faith? Are we, redeemed by His blood, really Christ's own through faith in His atoning merits? Do we walk as it becomes the heirs of the eternal home whose occupancy is promised us? Vv. 6—9. And we should not fail to give a frank answer to these questions.

b. Then, does a blessed certainty fill our hearts as to our future occupancy of this glorious and eternal dwelling? Can we say, "We have a building of God," etc.? v. 1. Are we sure of it, unseen though it be? V. 8b. Are we confident, as was Paul, vv. 6, 8, though we as yet walk "not by sight?" V. 7. Are we sure that God will bring us the full fruition of our hopes and desires? Phil. 1, 6.

c. And if this blessed certainty is in us, there will be present an earnest and continuous longing for the approach of the blessed moment of this glorious exchange of dwellings, v. 2. We groan in this mortal body and desire that soon mortality may be swallowed up by life, v. 4b. Hymn 509, 1—4.

d. Finally, the anticipatory thought of this desirable exchange of dwellings will fill the believer's soul with comfort, joy, and peace even already here. Though we walk by faith and not by sight, v. 7; though we know not what joys await us in "Jerusalem the golden," Hymn 556, 1, we rejoice and exult in blessed anticipation of what is in store for us according to God's sure promises. Hymn 556, 3.

F. J. LANKENAU.



Miscellanea.

Is the Virgin Birth Important?

Prof. W. W. Adams, Th. D., writes as follows in answer to the above question (*Watchman-Examiner*, May 14, 1936):—

"The question of the importance of the incarnation may be answered in brief.

"Modern science in its various fields should make us chary of final conclusions regarding matters in debate. We have been startled so frequently that we live in an atmosphere of high expectancy. In the realms of both natural and historical science we are becoming accustomed to revising former pronouncements of scholarship. If any difference, this situation has proved embarrassing to the doubter more than to the believer. The total result is the enrichment of life, the broadening and deepening and stabilizing of the foundations of faith. This is particularly true for the man of faith in the great basic facts of the Christian religion.

"The truly scientific spirit to-day is humble in the presence of God and the universe. We are finite, earth-bound. 'We are poor judges of what may or may not be involved in so transcendent a fact as the incarnation; and if, according to the evidence we have, this was actually the way in which God brought His Son into the world, it would be wiser for us to assume that there is a doctrinal connection, whether we can see it or not, than hastily to conclude that the Virgin Birth is of indifference to faith.'

"*An Important Fact.*—If the Virgin Birth is a fact, it is important; no fact can be unimportant. Moreover, it must be important for followers of Christ to 'know' facts which are imbedded in Holy Writ. 'If Jesus Christ was really born without human father, if that was really God's way for our Savior to enter into the world, then it may certainly be assumed that it was the best way. . . . We are not concerned now to assert anything so self-evident as that. But what we do assert now is not only that the Virgin Birth was important as an event, but that it is important for us to know, that we could not have remained ignorant of it without loss.' This is profoundly true.

"Yet there are those who deny the importance of the Virgin Birth. This discussion takes various forms. One is that, since the Virgin Birth is not a 'saving' doctrine, it is not essential. The answer to this is that Christ purposes to do more for His followers than merely introduce them to God. Another form is that, since the Virgin Birth is an open question or at least is difficult to comprehend and harmonize with present-day philosophical theories, we had better dispense with the doctrine altogether. The answer to this charge is that no answer is needed for so unscientific an attitude toward history. Again, it is said that the only important thing about the Incarnation is its 'motive'; the 'method' matters little. The answer is that 'the method ought to be commensurate with the motive. Unless it is proportionate to the motive, its insufficiency may be so great the motive becomes abortive.'

"Scholars have frequently pointed out the inconsistency of many who charge that the Virgin Birth is unimportant. The very vehemence and persistency with which the Virgin Birth is assailed and denounced rises up and smites to the ground the idea that that which is so assailed is lacking in importance.

"Results of Denial.—Once again, the deep meaning of Christ's incarnation can be measured from the point of view of the results among those who deny the Virgin Birth. Despite frequent claims to the contrary, it is sadly true that as a general rule those who deny the miraculous birth of Christ tend to deny all the miraculous in Him. And when the miraculous, supernatural Christ is gone, essential Christianity is gone.

"Designating the Virgin Birth as the 'vestibule' doctrine of Christianity, Dr. J. B. Champion warns us 'of belittling the seriousness of the situation which to-day confronts the Church of God. Grant a man that it does not matter to you that he is battering down the vestibule of your place of worship; when he has finished that, he will be in a mood to disregard what further you may grant or think. Your indifference has given him a foothold for further work of destruction; and he is more than likely to make use of his opportunity, for his advantage is your disadvantage.'"

P. E. K.

The Series on the *satisfactio vicaria*.

With the present issue the series on the vicarious atonement of Christ is being concluded. A few readers of this monthly have expressed a slight surprise that the matter of the substitutionary sacrifice of the Savior was treated along the lines of Biblical theology on the basis of practically all proof-texts of the New Testament.

But there is a definite reason for presenting this doctrine in such detail. For, in the first place, it is the correlate of the doctrine of justification, according to which the merits of the Redeemer are imputed to men. In the second place, recent events in the world of theological thinking have definitely shown that even men who are classed as conservatives are hopelessly in error with regard to the vicarious atonement and men's relation to it. Thus the recent book by Moore, *The Nature of Religion*, was favorably reviewed by a number of theological journals, while we pointed out some of its glaring mistakes and deficiencies. (See the present volume, p. 797.) Just how serious the aberrations of this leader of theological thought in the East are appears from the following excerpt taken from the section "The Transcendent," under the subhead "Of the Relation of Jesus to God." There we are told: "Our whole conception of salvation is altered. Therewith are altered our conceptions both of the Savior and the saved. We do not now think of salvation in terms which once prevailed in the Greek Church, a sense which is quite obvious in some of the most famous of the Fathers. This was the sense of some sort of union in essence—that was the phrase—of the redeemed man with God, which union in essence was to be fulfilled when life is over. 'Man's becoming God,' the ancient phrase ran. This phrase some of the Fathers used, I suppose, in some mystical sense; 'God became man in order that man might become God.' Or, again, we do not think of salvation, as often in the medieval Church, as a conferment, a benefit, almost externally bestowed,

a reward, or, with others, a consequence of election in the inscrutable goodness of God. It was the alteration of our relation to God or, at all events, the change of God's disposition toward us in view of the merit and satisfaction of our Redeemer Jesus Christ. It was like an acquittal—only not like an acquittal, in that it was conferred upon those who had been guilty, but whose guilt God in mercy passed over. It was imputing to us, even now, of Christ's righteousness—a phrase which some Protestants almost down to our own time have gloried in using. And then, by consequence, it was also our entrance into a heaven of bliss by and by. *We no longer think of salvation as something simply wrought out on our behalf. It is not a favor granted to us in view of something which some one else has done.** And, frankly, we are simply unable to think of righteousness as imputed to anybody. Whatever else might be imputed, it could not be righteousness in ourselves. We feel that this is a contradiction in terms. We cannot think of blessedness as simply prepared for us. We have to think of ourselves as prepared for blessedness, and this by a measure of blessedness which we now actually share. We cannot think of our being supremely and eternally blessed, unless we are in ourselves prepared in some slight measure, or at least preparing, to be blessed. When we put it in these words, we see how far an interpretation inherited from the medieval Church and descending to us from classical Protestantism no longer avails. . . . In all of these respects it [religious life] has been, is, and it will be, not a mere conferment. It must be, and more and more it has been, my life. It is I who live it, physically, mentally, spiritually. . . . But I am able to think of no reward, and least of all of a reward from the all-knowing God, *for what I have not tried to be and do.* In fact, I do not like to think of it as a reward at all. It is just living recognition of a life which is my life. . . . It needs no saying that there is something transactional, unreal, about the very supposition that man's real guilt could be ascribed by the All-Holy to another and the righteousness of the other avail for man himself." (Pp. 250—253, 303.) We leave it to our readers to judge whether there is need of our constantly emphasizing the vicarious atonement and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ by grace.

P. E. K.

Educating the Minister for To-Morrow.

This was the topic of an address before the Southern Baptist Convention by Prof. J. B. Weatherspoon, the following paragraph of which is not only informational, but is full of suggestions regarding the situation in our own Synod.

"There are also enlargement needs. The membership of our churches grows at the rate of 100,000 annually, new churches are organized at the rate of 80 to 100 annually, missionary and denominational tasks call for an increasing number of our best-trained men, and multiplied millions wait to be evangelized at home and abroad. The unemployed preachers to-day cannot be attributed to the limitation of the need for either replacement or expansion. Churches and tasks are calling for men, but they are calling for men who in personality and training are capable of adjustment and

* Italics ours.

leadership. The task of improvement is quite as pressing as that of replacement and enlargement. This is not meant to disparage in the least the work of the noble men who have labored without the advantage of college or seminary training. Among them have been some of our greatest preachers and leaders, both of yesterday and to-day. And they would be the first to urge a better provision for, and insistence upon, a fully trained ministry. Not many years ago I heard one of them in a public address to a group of theological students urging them to use their opportunity fully, reminding them that they could gain in a few years under guidance what he had imperfectly gained only through many years of unguided struggle. Here our need is staggering. But for one of the larger denominations in the South we shall have a 'bad preeminence' in an uneducated ministry. The following figures are ten years old, but they fairly represent our situation. In 1926 only 14.4 per cent. of our preachers (15,000) had both college and seminary training, 14.9 per cent. had a college education only, 5.8 per cent. had seminary training only, while 64.9 per cent. had neither college nor seminary training. These figures do not include the situation in the colored ministry. One has heard of cold facts and cold figures; but these are hot, they burn our cheeks. When less than 15 per cent. of our Southern Baptist preachers have a full academic and theological education, the denomination as a whole must bear the responsibility and raise the question of our place in the world and whether or not we shall bestir ourselves to meet the demands of to-day and to-morrow."

P. E. K.

Zwei Fragen betreffs Bernhards von Clairvaux.

Die Hauptereignisse in dem Leben dieses bedeutenden Lehrers des Mittelalters liegen in jedem einigermaßen vollständigen Geschichtsbuch sowie in jeder größeren Enzyklopädie vor, daß er nämlich von 1090 bis 1153 lebte, daß er Gründer und Abt des Klosters zu Clairvaux wurde und daß er als einer der hervorragendsten Männer seiner Zeit gilt.

Zwei Fragen aber sind es, die immer wieder auftauchen. Die erste betrifft seine Lehr- und Glaubensstellung oder, wie man es schon ausgedrückt hat: War Bernhard ein Lutheraner vor Luther? Darauf ist zunächst zu sagen, daß schon sein erster Biograph von ihm redet als magnanimus in fide, longanimis in spe, profusus in charitate, summus in humilitate, praecipuus in pietate, wozu ein anderer noch hinzufügt: humanissimus in affectione, magis tam forte in fide.*) Dabei war aber Bernhard ein rabiatere Mönch, wie wir aus der Episode seine Schwester betreffend sehen, die er nach jahrelangem Zureden bewog, sich von ihrem Mann zu trennen und ihre Tage in einem Kloster zu beschließen. Bekannt ist auch Bernhards Eifer für die Kreuzzüge, namentlich den zweiten, zu dem er mit leidenschaftlicher Verehrsamkeit aufgefordert hatte. Bei alledem aber hatte Bernhard eine tiefe Einsicht in die Wahrheit des göttlichen Wortes, besonders auch in die Erlösungstat Christi, und als es mit ihm zum Sterben kam, da tröstete er sich, wie Luther wohl an die zehnmahl erinnert, ganz und gar der Tatsache, daß er Christi Verdienst ergreifen könne. In seinen Predigten über das Evangelium Johannis schreibt Luther: „Wie St. Bernhard auch

*) Bal. Schaff, V, 343, nota.

tat; ob er wohl seinen Orden streng gehalten hatte, noch, da er sterben sollte, da hat er vor allen andern Lehrern den lieben Herrn Christum sonderlich ausgestrichen und seine Lust und Freude an ihm gehabt und gesagt: Der Herr Christus ist mein Herr und hat auf zweierlei Weise das Himmelreich und mir dasselbige erworben; dadurch will ich auch selig werden.“ (VII, 1841 ff.; vgl. Kol. 1950.)

Die zweite Frage betrifft die geistlichen Gesänge Bernhards; denn man hat früher alle Lieder, die etwa zu Anfang des 12. Jahrhunderts entstanden sind, ohne weiteres Bernhard zugeschrieben. Selbst Trench hat diese Ansicht noch im allgemeinen geteilt und wollte nur *Cur mundus militat* und *O miranda vanitas* ausgenommen haben. Julian (*Dictionary of Hymnology*) ist bedeutend vorsichtiger. Er nennt nur die folgenden Lieder als von Bernhard verfaßt: *Iesu dulcis memoria* („O Jesu süß, wer dein gedenkst“; „O Jesus, King most wonderful“), *Laetabundus, exultat fidelis chorus, Cum sit omnis homo foenum*. Nicht so gut beglaubigt sind *Ut iucundas cervus undas* und *Eheu, eheu, mundi vitas*.

Über die Serie der sieben Gedichte an die Glieder des gemarterten Heilandes sind die Forscher sich noch nicht einig. Es sind dies *Salve, mundi salutare* (an die Füße), *Salve, Iesu, Rex sanctorum* (an die Knie), *Salve, Iesu, Pastor bone* (an die Hände), *Salve, Iesu, summe bonus* (an die Seite), *Salve, salus mea, Deus* (an die Brust), *Salve, Regis cor aveto* (an das Herz) und *Salve, caput cruentatum* (an das Angesicht des leidenden Heilandes). Die ersten vier dieser Gedichte stammen wahrscheinlich von Bernhard selber. Mone schreibt (*Hymni Latini*, I, 167): „Die vorstehenden vier Lieder haben gleichen Umfang. . . Das Gedicht hat auch in andern Handschriften viele Veränderungen erfahren, worüber in den Ausgaben der Werke Bernhards nichts gesagt wird. Die Nachforschung über den Verfasser wird dadurch erschwert; es ist nur wahrscheinlich, daß die Lieder von einem französischen Dichter herrühren, weil auch der Reim *reconde*: *profunde* auf diesen Ursprung hinweist.“

Noch zweifelhafter ist die Verfasserschaft der letzten drei Gedichte, von denen sowohl Mone wie Daniel urteilt, daß sie einer späteren Zeit angehören. Julian bemerkt dazu: „If their conclusions be correct, then the finest part of all, the *Salve, caput cruentatum*, must be by some one other than St. Bernhard.“ Dorsch (Das deutsche evangelische Kirchenlied, S. 20) scheint alle sieben Passionsalben dem Schüler Bernhards, Arnulf von Löwen (1200—1250), zuzuschreiben. Da die letzte der sieben Salben nicht vor dem 15. Jahrhundert bekannt geworden ist, mag sogar die neuere Theorie, daß die Verfasserschaft einer frommen Nonne zugeschrieben werden darf, noch eine Stütze finden.

P. E. K.

Theological Observer. — *Sirichli-Zeitgechithiliches.*

I. Amerika.

The Inspiration of the Scriptures Once More. — The *Lutheran* publishes in three instalments an address delivered by Dr. E. E. Flack at the opening services of Hamma Divinity School on "The Interpretation of the Word of God." There are several paragraphs which we should like to quote and comment on.

"Ignorance of the Scriptures even among Christian people is appalling. The misunderstanding of their significance has led to confusion, indifference, and even to despair on the part of many. On the one hand, there are those who so circumscribe the Scriptures by dogmatic theories of inspiration that they fail to find a response in the otherwise open minds of earnest seekers after truth, especially among the youth. And on the other hand, there are those who so secularize the Scriptures in their thinking that they no longer constitute for them the singular seat of authority in religion, their bases being reason, experience, self-realization, and the assured results of scientific investigation." One wonders what is meant here by "dogmatic theories of inspiration."

Further on in the address the speaker says: "One can never adequately describe dogmatically just how God has imparted eternal truth nor how men's minds have received, retained, and recorded it. Neither the Scriptures nor the Confessions of the Church set forth a dogma of inspiration. Both repeatedly bear testimony to the fact, but the method they quite properly leave in the realm of mystery. No process of rationalization can produce a satisfactory definition. It is not a truth to be taught by a theory, but a fact to be apprehended by faith — faith in the Triune God, the Father who reveals, the Son who effects, and the Spirit who applies, redemption; in the Scriptures as the faithful revelation; and in the witness of the Church as the response to redemption." We fully agree with the author that inspiration is a mystery and cannot be described by us. If he, in speaking of dogmatic theories of inspiration, has in mind some man-made description of the process, we join him in calling such theorizing unjustified.

Later the author quotes with approval the doctrinal statement of the U. L. C. which refers to the Scriptures: "We receive and hold the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God and as the only infallible rule and standard of faith and practise, according to which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged." Continuing, he says: "But a confessional statement, simple though it may be, constantly calls for explanation and interpretation. Since misunderstandings have arisen, the Church at the present time feels the need of examining and explaining anew her historic faith. In so doing, she begins with the Scriptures as the Word of God. Generally speaking, this is sufficient as a doctrinal declaration. This faith finds incontrovertible verification in the experience of Christian people of all ages, classes, and races the world over. It is not the universal Christian experience, however, that makes

the Bible the Word of God, but its own inherent quality as the God-given record of His redeeming grace, culminating in Christ, which finds recognition in the hearts of believers. Revelation is from faith to faith. But the Word of God is greater than the Book. In one sense it is identical with the Scriptures; in another, distinguishable from them. In certain passages in the writings of Luther we note the phrase 'the Word of God *and* the Scriptures' (cf. Holman Ed., I, 339), which indicates that he had a distinction in mind. Moreover, the Lutheran reformers spoke more particularly of the Scriptures than of the Bible, thereby avoiding Biblicism, or the reverencing of the Book as a thing in itself, which, in spite of the Christocentric faith of Luther, has developed, largely through the initial emphasis of Reformed theology, and has created no little confusion in the Church. Primarily and fundamentally the Word of God is the Gospel of Christ, the supreme personal revelation of God, who is set forth in the Scriptures. . . . The Scriptures are secondary, the means of grace through which the Spirit presents Christ to us. . . . It is Christ, the living Word, who gives to Scripture its authority. . . . Lutheran theology recognizes the primacy of the incarnation in Christian faith. We begin and end with Christ, the Alpha and the Omega of God's revelation. Of the two fundamental principles of the Protestant Reformation as later designated, the formal, or the authority of the Scriptures, and the material, or justification by faith, Lutheranism has emphasized the latter; Calvinism, the former. It was Luther's experience of justification by faith in Christ that constituted the starting-point of the Church of the Reformation. Calvinism was eccentric: it found its starting-point apart from Christ, in the divine decrees, and set forth a theory of inspiration that led to a peculiar Biblicism. With no less love for the Scriptures, the early Lutherans clung to their Christocentric faith and searched the Scriptures to find the Christ, in whom we have the ultimate authority. . . . Under the pressure of circumstances later dogmaticians set up the Bible in an external way in contrast with the outward Papacy, on the one hand, and with the position of the Enthusiasts, who sought authority in an inner light apart from Scripture, on the other, and thus permitted confusing conceptions to gain headway in the Church. We are under obligations to seek out anew the soul of Lutheranism in the experience of the Reformer and in the Confessions of the Church. Modern Lutheran research has done much toward the rediscovery of the faith that flowered in the Reformation. That faith unquestionably proceeds from Christ, who is the primary and central fact in revelation and redemption, and evaluates the Scriptures in relation to this eternal center of faith, subordinating the formal principle to the material. This is the genesis and the genius of Lutheranism. Herein lies her ecumenical character; for she recognizes the universal validity of Luther's experience of justification by faith in Christ, the Word of God Incarnate, not apart from, but preeminent in, the Holy Scriptures." On the whole we can say that we are in agreement with the author. Here and there his phraseology is somewhat ambiguous or at least not so clear as one should like it to be; besides, while he correctly points to the aberrations of the Reformed in their attitude toward the Bible, he should not have failed to emphasize that the Scriptures constituted the weapon with which Luther fought and conquered.

Expressions which aroused our positive dissent we found in the last section of the address: "When we speak of the authority of the Scriptures, we do not mean that they are independently authoritative. They have no authority either apart from Christ, who is the primary authority, or apart from the Church, in which Christ's power is operative. 'Ye are My witnesses,' says our Lord. 'The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit,' affirms Paul. Without the true Church, 'the pillar and ground of the truth,' which responds to the witness of the Spirit and thereby allows the magnetic circuit of saving grace to find fruition, the Bible would be only a book. . . . It is in the Church alone that the Word and Sacraments are operative." Here we are bewildered. If the author means that it is the Church's duty to proclaim the Gospel and to bring it to those who are without it, we of course agree with him; but if he should mean to say (we hardly can believe that this is in his mind) that the Bible, when sold by an unbelieving bookseller and bought by an unbeliever, has ceased to be the power of God unto salvation and to have authority, we strongly disagree.

Similarly we cannot understand the author when he says in one of his closing paragraphs: "The standard by which all dogmas and teachers are to be judged is not the Scriptures standing utterly alone, but the Word of God attested and authenticated in the Spirit-filled life of the early Church and projected through the centuries from faith to faith in the corporate mind of the true Church." Is it possible that the author here, like the Gnostics, holds that Christ had some teaching, esoteric teaching they called it, which was not put into the Scriptures? Does he hold that, after all, the Roman Catholic Church is right when it says: "Not the Scriptures alone, but the Scriptures and tradition"? The following sentence of the author seems to indicate that what he means to say is not anything of this sort: "The attestation, therefore, is three-fold: it is the witness of the Church, supported by apostolic testimony and certified in the Scriptures." It seems, then, that after all, according to the author's view, the witness of the Church does not have any authority for us unless it is certified in the Scriptures, which simply means, in spite of the many words used, that the Bible is the standard by which we judge dogmas and teachers. Again we say, we are sorry that the trumpet of the author has not given a more certain sound and that here and there its notes seem to be contradictory. A.

The Lutheran Free Church and Unionism. — When the *Journal of the American Lutheran Conference* in its October, 1936, issue published an article on the Lutheran Free Church, it gave truly authentic information on this body; for not only is the Lutheran Free Church a constituent part of the conference in whose name the journal appears, but the writer of the article, H. C. Casperan, is a member of the Lutheran Free Church and represents this synod on the editorial board of the journal. For these reasons we hold that, if an indictment of the Lutheran Free Church is based on this article, the source of information cannot be said to be unreliable and colored by an unfriendly bias. Now let the reader look at the following paragraph taken from this article and see whether it does not contain evidence that the Lutheran Free Church is pursuing an unscriptural course: —

"In accordance with the principles of the Lutheran Free Church the hand of altar- and pulpit-fellowship is always extended to sister congregations of the Lutheran faith of whatever synod without further ado. It looks upon discussion about fine points of doctrine among Lutherans as futile and unnecessary and leading nowhere except to suspicion and division and consequent confusion regarding the salient and fundamental points of doctrine among Lutheran Christians. It is not unionistic in the loose sense of that term; but it does believe that Lutherans of all synods may meet and pray together without first having to sign a contract or document of doctrinal adjustment. It does not forbid its ministers to fellowship with pastors and church-members of the Reformed faith if found necessary and proper for the sake of Christian brotherliness and the work in general; the decision as to propriety and necessity is left entirely with the individual pastor and his own conscience."

We note, 1) that the Lutheran Free Church considers the name Lutheran a sufficient guarantee of spiritual unity and will not refuse to fellowship with synods and congregations and their members bearing that name; 2) that even with respect to the Reformed churches it erects no bars against fellowship with them. The apparent restriction concerning such fellowship, "if found necessary and proper for the sake of Christian brotherliness and the work in general," is meaningless as a restriction; for is there anybody who will engage in any fellowship at all without holding it to be "necessary and proper for the sake of Christian brotherliness and the work in general"? In the attitude of the Lutheran Free Church the American Lutheran Conference has a serious problem to deal with, and if it is not willing to lay itself open to the charge of indifference, it cannot avoid giving this its serious attention. A.

"What shall be Done with Our Call System?" — Under this heading a young Norwegian pastor, five years in the ministry, presents to the readers of the *Lutheran Herald* (Oct. 20) a problem which largely is also our own and deserves careful study in our circles, too. And properly it should be discussed not only at our pastoral conferences, but also in our voters' meetings and in general church assemblies. The writer's lines contain much emotional stress; evidently he has been so deeply offended at the unchristian treatment of the doctrine of the divine call by both congregations and pastors that the reader cannot but pity him in his mental anguish and spiritual distress.

But are not dozens of young (and old) pastors of our own Church in the same plight, and do we not owe them brotherly consideration in helping them to adjust themselves to the difficult problems which they face? Surely our answer must not be: "Well, young upstart brother, wait until you have been in the ministry twenty years longer; for then you will be able to grin and bear it the rest of your days," but we must give them a clear, helpful, Biblical reply, which does away with disorder and restores to order our practise regarding the calling of ministers and teachers. But let us see what the above young pastor has to say. He writes in part: —

"I left the seminary with very high ideals about the divine call. These five years have left me somewhat disillusioned after witnessing the dis-

respect shown the divine call by pastors and congregations. In two instances, places where I served temporarily while the congregation was vacant, I became greatly surprised at the attitude pastors took toward such a vacancy. Dozens of applications were received, and from the tone of some of these applications the reader would have every reason to believe that the applicant was applying for a position as a teacher in the local high school. Some even included pictures of their families, and there was no hesitancy in mentioning the different things they could do. It isn't only the pastor who is to be blamed, the congregation must also share in the responsibility for such a situation. I know of one case during a biennial meeting of our synod that a congregation held meetings every night of the week, not for the purpose of edification, but solely to select a candidate for their church. Have we come to the stage where the pastor must parade whatever oratorical abilities he may have in order to secure a call? Can one who knows he is preaching a trial sermon feel that such a call is truly divine? One committee of a large congregation called a pastor by long distance, asking him if he would come and preach a trial sermon. The pastor, holding the divine call sacred, naturally refused, and consequently he was told that his name would be stricken off the list of candidates. Are trial sermons to be the way in which pastors are to find new fields of labor? If so, where does the divine call enter in? One can perhaps excuse pastors who are desperate in seeking new places to serve and are forced to resort to any method to make a change. But is there not something radically wrong when such a state exists? Surely some adjustment can be made to avoid these humiliating practises, which cheapen the office of the holy ministry. We may question the methods of other church-bodies, but one is tempted to say that any system is better than the one we are suffering under. The situation in our call system is such that steps must be taken to bring about a change. Pastors should be given an opportunity to change their fields of labor without selling out those things held sacred from seminary days. There should not be a condition where a large percentage of our clergy desires to move and is unable to move because of lack of authority of any group to make the necessary adjustments.

"Furthermore, I believe that congregations should be taught to look upon their pastor not as a hired man, but as a servant called by God. He is worthy of his hire and should be assured an income that will care for his immediate needs and provide for his dear ones. I shall never forget the statement made by a consecrated pastor of a sister synod who looks forward to the coming winter months without a charge. He is a victim of staying too long in one field, suffering from the same system that we hold to, and the congregation which he served has without any reason told him to leave. He left a \$300-a-month job during good times to enter the holy ministry. Now, after ten years of service, his congregation refuses to pay him a living wage and took the alternative of telling him to leave. This consecrated servant said that in all his dealings with business organizations he has never been treated by business as he has experienced from this supposed-to-be Christian congregation. What an indictment upon a congregation which should above all others reveal a Christian spirit! One could go on and mention other incidents, but these

conditions should awaken us to the realization that something is wrong, and drastic steps should be taken.

"I know that there will be some reading this who will say, Here is one who entered the ministry because of the income. No just person can make such an accusation when common sense shows that one who spends seven to eight years in preparation, even more than one who is preparing for the medical profession, could go into any other profession and be assured of a better income and above all not be in a position where there is a daily sword over his head of being stranded at middle age. Consecrated servants have sacrificed, and are willing to do so, in situations that require cross-bearing. But God does not excuse congregations that capitalize upon the zeal of such a consecrated pastor and cause him to be a martyr when martyrdom is due to unchristian acts.

"As a young pastor who desires to continue serving the Master and not leave the ministry because of the precarious future which we now have under the present system, and also pleading to hold high our ideals of the divine call, let us as pastors and congregations exert every effort to restore a Christian order, not only in the calling of servants to this high office, but also make the necessary adjustments, so that every pastor is in position to meet his expenses and care for his loved ones."

J. T. M.

Is the Social Gospel Waning?—In writing about the so-called "National Preaching Mission," which began in Pittsburgh September 20, when a group of men headed by Stanley Jones and George W. Truett and Ivan Lee Holt started a series of meetings to be held in all the large cities of our country, Dr. John Knox of the staff of the *Christian Century* says that the emphasis of the renowned preachers was not on the social gospel. On the contrary, he summarizes the message of these so-called "missioners" thus: "We must go back to the spiritual Gospel of our fathers. We have talked enough for a while about social, economic, and political matters; we need now to cultivate the roots of the Christian life. The authentic message of the preacher is the Gospel of individual redemption through the grace of God in Christ. If we can get men saved, everything else will work itself out." Commenting on this, Dr. Knox very characteristically says: "This message, so familiar to all who belong to the Protestant evangelical tradition, was presented with rare sincerity, winsomeness, and effect. There is no doubt that the hearts of hundreds warmed to it; my own heart did. But as a presumably adequate and relevant answer to the needs of our time it left me, I must confess, utterly dissatisfied. Of course, one who knows the men who compose this mission will not need to be told that several of them show genuine concern about some of the social responsibilities which the Christian Church can evade only at the cost of its life and our world's life. I shall refer later to two exceptional addresses in this regard. But this concern, I think it can be fairly said, lay either at the periphery of their messages, or else their messages lay at the periphery of the program. The National Preaching Mission considered as a whole did not speak in Pittsburgh a strong, sure, unequivocal word about the responsibilities of the Church for the character of our civilization. Although there was much said, and truly earnestly

said, about sin and repentance, there was little, if any, attempt to bring about contrition for our terrible social sins. I do not believe it is wrong to say that the Preaching Mission is in conception, at any rate in some measure, a conscious and sound reaction against what has frequently passed as the social gospel."

The two exceptions that the writer had in mind were the addresses by Bishop Freeman of Washington (Episcopalian) and Stanley Jones. The feature which Dr. Knox is complaining of is certainly not due to any lack of interest on the part of the "missioners" in the growth and development of social justice, but—so we are inclined to believe and hope—to the conviction of at least some of them that, before society can be changed, the individual must be changed and that the required change in the individual is brought about only through faith in Jesus Christ, the Savior. A.

The Chicago Quadrilateral.—Episcopalian papers remind us that fifty years have passed since the House of Bishops of their Church issued an official declaration in which four points are mentioned as essential to the union of Christian denominations. The four points published October 30, 1886, are:—

"1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the revealed Word of God. 2. The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith. 3. The two Sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him. 4. The historic episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church."

As we are writing this, word comes from Chicago, where the Episcopal bishops are assembled, that a revision of the Chicago Quadrilateral, which a few years after its issuance was adopted by the Lambeth Conference also, is to be formulated. Whatever declaration will be published will have special importance, because not only the bishops of the United States are attending the Chicago meeting, but likewise those of other countries in the New World, so that the meeting has been called the "Little Lambeth of the West." It will be interesting to see, if a new pronouncement should be formulated, whether this, too, will cling to the unscriptural principle of the "historic episcopate" and make acceptance of it an essential condition of union. A.

The Present Status of the Evolution Theory.—An editorial in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* discusses this subject as follows: "The corner-stone of this unscriptural Protestantism is the theory of evolution as it has affected the whole realm of human thinking, scientific, philosophical, and religious. It has foisted upon human history an interpretation of the development of the race wholly unwarranted by the facts. A great service to the Church is being performed by writers such as Dr. Hale and Amos of England, who reiterated the fact that true scientists are abandoning the claim of proofs upon which the theory of evolution must continue to stand and that it is the liberal theologians, who have rewritten their theologies to conform to this discredited theory, that are unable to extricate themselves from the errors of the many implications of this false philosophy.

They are behind the times in the realm of science. Professor Schwarze of New York University, member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, has said in one of Mr. Olsen's broadcasts: "The evolutionary theory is held only by the unthinking, those who have not followed the latest developments in scientific research, or by those who, because of enmity in their hearts against God, deliberately present (particularly to young and immature minds) this evident delusion as established science. Real scientists have recognized the fact that evolution cannot be proved, whether or not they accept the Bible as God's revelation regarding life and its origin. It may seem strange that men will still cling to a theory that is unprovable and really unscientific, but sinful men would rather believe in it than in an omnipotent God."

In the same number of *Bibliotheca Sacra*, in a sample broadcast of the Mid-week Forum Hour of Station WMAC, New York, quotations from a number of great scientists are submitted which are pertinent, all testifying that science cannot answer our deepest questions and that what the evolution theory tried to solve by a natural explanation is still unsolved except for those who follow divine revelation. When Professor Einstein was asked what science had to say about moral truth, he replied: "Practical philosophy would mean a philosophy of conduct, and I do not think that science can teach men to be moral. I do not believe that moral philosophy can ever be founded on a scientific basis. Of that I am certain. The content of scientific theory itself offers no moral foundation for the personal conduct of life." In his autobiography Mr. H. G. Wells says: "I cannot adjust myself to secure any fruitful peace. Here I am at sixty-five, still seeking for peace. There is no rest for us before the goal." Dr. Henry Pritchett, for a quarter of a century president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, made this admission: "The man of science awaits some convincing proof of personal immortality, and until such proof can be secured, he neither believes nor disbelieves in it. He simply puts this question aside as one for the present unsolved and, as far as he can see at this moment, unsolvable by any means available to thinking men. What the future may reveal he does not attempt to say; what may await him after death he knows not." Prof. Robert A. Millikan, winner of the Nobel prize in physics in 1923, stated: "Concerning what ultimately becomes of the individual, science has added nothing, and it has subtracted nothing. That problem is entirely outside the field of science now." And finally, Dr. George Sarton, Associate in the History of Science in the Carnegie Institution of Washington, author of *An Introduction to the History of Science*, says: "The wonders of science are innumerable; they are such that the wildest dreams of the Arabian tellers seem childish in comparison; and yet, when it comes to the mysteries of life and death, which are man's supreme concern, what do we know? Whence do we come, and where are we going? Is the universe created or uncreated? Is it eternal, or did it begin at some time? No scientist can answer these questions. He is about on the same level as a child, except that he is more fully aware of his ignorance. Even as money can buy everything except the things which really matter, even so science can explain everything except the essential mysteries of life." A.

Episcopal Church Not Moving toward Rome.—That Rome is vitally interested in regaining the ecclesiastical ground it has lost in England is a matter about which there is no dispute. Nor can it be denied that there are many Episcopalians in England and America who earnestly desire the Anglican Church to return to the bosom of "Mother Church." That, however, the Episcopal Church is not moving toward Rome is the claim which is made by Bishop Stewart, as reported in *Christianity To-day* (September, 1936), where we read: "While making a plea for Christian unity, Bishop Stewart, in his charge to the ninety-ninth annual diocesan convention, Chicago, on February 4, declared pointedly that the Church can never submit to Rome to accomplish such unity. Referring to the recent call for church unity issued by twenty-nine members of the Church, the bishop termed this an 'out-and-out piece of pro-Roman propaganda,' adding: 'As a result of this the rumor went abroad that the Episcopal Church was swiftly moving toward submission to the Holy See. Nothing could be farther from the facts. The Anglican Communion, which includes the Episcopal Church, is like the Orthodox Eastern Church both catholic and apostolic; yet neither of these communions is in communion with the Holy See.'" In denying the infallibility of the Pope, which, as Bishop Stewart said, can never be accepted by the Church, he stated: "There are, it is true, many differences between our communion and Rome, but the root of the difference is in the enormous claims of the Bishop of Rome to be, by divine appointment, the sovereign Pontiff of the whole Church of Christ, the sole fountain of jurisdiction, so that no bishop can have rightful authority except as it is given him by the Pope. This claim, which cannot be sustained by appeal to Scripture or to the early Church, reflects not the mind of Christ, but the mind of an ecclesiastical Caesar, and it is put forth with astonishing effrontery to-day in a world which no longer recognizes the divine right of kings. By all means let us pray for the reunion of all Christians, including our brethren [*sic*!] of the Roman communion, and let us keep ourselves free from that ignorant prejudice which strangely confuses Catholic teaching and practise and ceremonial with that of the Latin Church and which flames into passion at even the suggestion of similarities. But let us also keep it clear and make it clear that, if we are Catholics in faith and order, in sacramental life and sacramental worship, we are also protestants against every claim of the Roman hierarchy to substitute a part for the whole, substitute the Holy Roman Church for that article of our belief which we profess—the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, which includes Rome and Canterbury and a great deal besides." (*Sic*!)

This expression shows both the strength and the weakness of Anglican opposition to Rome. True Anglicans oppose Romanism chiefly because of the question of supreme authority in the Church. Modern Anglicanism thus holds to the original *status controversiae*, i. e., that between Henry VIII and the Popes of his time. The weakness in Anglican opposition to Rome lies in its failure to realize the importance of the doctrinal issues at stake as well as in its inability to judge what is Christian doctrine. If the question of authority were settled between Anglicanism and Romanism, the other differences could easily be adjusted, at least so far as the majority of Anglican communicants come into question. J. T. M.

Plans of the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work.—

Next year, July 12—26, the World Conference of Non-Roman Churches will be held in Oxford, England. The chairman of the great gathering will be the Archbishop of Canterbury. The following subjects have been put on the program for discussion:—

"1) The Church and the Community, in particular the relation of the Church to the common life of man as shaped by national tradition, expressing itself in characteristic folk-ways and determined by current standards and values.

"2) The Church and the State, including consideration of the Christian view of the State, of the claims of the contemporary State, and of the Christian conception of freedom of conscience.

"3) The Church, Society, and the State in Relation to Economic Order, including the various new proposals for the regulation of man's economic life.

"4) The Church, Society, and the State in Relation to Education. This will have to do with the particularly acute and pressing difficulties which have arisen as the State has increased its claims over the whole of the citizen's outlook and training.

"5) The Universal Church and a World of Nations—nationalism, international relations, the Church as a supranational society, Christianity, and war."

We are told that the churches which will participate will be represented by three hundred regularly elected delegates, who in their deliberations will be assisted by one hundred invited expert consultants and four hundred associates identified with the various kinds of church activity. As the program indicates, the social gospel will be altogether in the foreground. A.

Congregationalists Elect a Woman Superintendent of Churches.

The Middle Atlantic Conference of Congregational and Christian Churches, according to the *Christian Century*, has elected Mrs. David E. Brown one of the thirty-seven superintendents of American Congregationalism, putting her in charge of the field which comprises New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. The report says: "As superintendent of ninety churches, 23,518 communicants, and a constituency of more than seventy thousand people, Mrs. Brown is at once chief executive for the promotion of the interests of all the national and foreign boards, the conference representative of the boards in matters of church-building grants, ministerial pensions, and sick-relief; director of conference programs for evangelism, social action, religious education, and young people's activities, and chief representative of the denomination in interchurch relationships of the area. Through the office of the superintendent are conducted the relationships of the conference with the General Council. She is also the consultant of churches and ministers in the settlement of pastors." Mrs. Brown, in other words, is a "pastor at large." What the Bible has to say on the position of women in the Church in 1 Cor. 14 and 1 Tim. 2 apparently no longer is of any importance to these people. A.

Deceased.—The church-papers report that the American Lutheran Church (to be more specific, the section of the American Lutheran Church which formerly constituted the Ohio Synod) recently lost two prominent

men through death, Dr. L. H. Schuh, from 1901 to 1912 president of Capital University and at the time of his death pastor emeritus of St. Paul's Church, Toledo, O., and Dr. J. G. Kroening, once upon a time Missouri Synod professor at Springfield, Ill., and Milwaukee, Wis., and from 1908 to 1927 professor of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew at Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., an institution of the Ohio Synod. Dr. Kroening reached an age of eighty-five years. A

Brief Items.—The Presbyterian Church lost a prominent minister when in September Dr. Edmund B. Chaffee died as he was delivering a lecture before the Minnesota Conference of Social Work. He was pastor of the so-called Labor Temple in New York, a \$750,000 institution. What he was particularly interested in were problems that had to do with social work.—Dr. H. McAlester Griffiths has resigned as editor of the *Presbyterian Guardian* to become the counsel of the Presbyterian Church of America in the suit brought against it by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The new editors of the *Presbyterian Guardian* are Dr. J. Gresham Machen and Dr. Ned B. Stonehouse of Westminster Theological Seminary.—The Thirty-third International Eucharistic Congress is to be held in Manila February 3—7, 1937. It is thought that a million people will go to attend the Congress.—Prof. Adolf Deissmann of Berlin will soon observe his seventieth birthday. A fund is being raised in his honor. He is best known probably through his book *Licht vom Osten*. His studies in New Testament Greek have had a profound influence on grammatical and lexicographical views.—Writing on the subject "Hitler and Buchman," Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Seminary, in the *Christian Century* of October 7, publishes a devastating article on the latter, who was quoted by the press to have said: "I thank heaven for a man like Adolf Hitler, who built a front-line defense against the antichrist of Communism." In the concluding paragraph of the article Professor Niebuhr says: "The Oxford Group Movement, imagining itself the mediator of Christ's salvation in a catastrophic age, is really an additional evidence of the decay in which we stand."—*Bibliotheca Sacra*, in its July-September number for 1936, carries an article which has the title "A Sketch of Mohammedanism," from which we take over a few sentences: "To-day 250 million people claim Mohammed as their chief prophet. In the British Empire there are more than one hundred million Moslems. When King Edward VIII was crowned and proclaimed to be, among other titles, 'the Defender of the Faith,' one could well have asked, 'Defender of what faith?' for there are more Moslems under the British flag than Christians. There are about ten publications for propagating Mohammedanism printed in English. . . . In our own country there are about thirty thousand Mohammedans. They are living principally in Brooklyn, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Sioux City, Iowa, Wheeling, W. Va., and Worcester, Mass. Of all non-Christians, Moslems are perhaps the most difficult to win to Christianity. They cling tenaciously to their faith. In forty years of Dutch Reformed missions among Moslems, for instance, there were fewer than forty converts. In all Egypt to-day, where missionaries have toiled long and hard, there are only about 110 living converts from Mohammedanism to Christianity."—There is an American Association of Theological Schools whose president is Dr. A. A. Brown, president of Drew University. Accord-

ing to a statement of Dr. Frederick C. Grant, president of Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston, who is the vice-president of the association, the organization is striving to introduce higher standards in theological education. The association endeavors to do what the American Association of Universities has done for college education in the United States. "New and higher standards of admission have been set up and an accredited list of seminaries adopted."—In Chicago a decision was rendered lately by a judge of which all people who have an interest in the morals of our country will heartily approve. Somebody had taken moving pictures in a nudist camp and brought the films to the Eastman Kodak Company to have them developed. When this had been done, the Eastman Company refused to return the films to the owner, pointing out that they were indecent. The judge agreed that the kodak firm was justified in its stand and that it was proper for it to destroy the films.—The so-called "untouchables" in India are asking themselves whether they should become Christians or Mohammedans or embrace Sikhism. The Sikhs represent a community of about four hundred thousand living in the Punjab. Since the Sikhs are simply a Hindu sect, the union of the "untouchables" with them would not take the latter out of the fold of heathenism. We are told that Dr. Ambedkar, a leader of the depressed classes of India, advises these people to join the Sikhs. Since the "untouchables" number about sixty-five million, their accession to the Sikhs would mean an immense strengthening of this section of Hinduism. One's heart grieves at the thought that these people are advised to go from one darkness into another.—"The decree of the administrator of the former German New Guinea that native evangelists are not to be employed in carrying the Gospel to heathen tribes in the uncontrolled inland is, so we are informed, upheld by the federal government. The deputation that recently waited on Senator Pearce, the minister for Mandated Territory at Canberra, received a courteous hearing, but has since been informed that the decree of the administrator must stand. . . . This means that native workers are not allowed to be placed in the 'uncontrolled areas of New Guinea.'" These words are quoted from the *Australian Lutheran*, which, on account of the work which our Australian brethren are doing in New Guinea, is very much interested in the situation there. The report concludes with the words: "This means that the sword must precede the Gospel. What a cry of protest this should raise in Christian lands!"—A Baptist church in Philadelphia, called Temple Church, formerly served by the well-known Russell H. Conwell, has done a strange thing—it has called as its pastor Dr. Poling, a Dutch Reformed minister, who was baptized in infancy and, at that, not immersed, but baptized by affusion. He accepted the call with the understanding that, while the church will not itself practise any other baptism than that by immersion, it is willing to receive as members people who have been baptized by sprinkling and in infancy. This is additional proof that Baptists are surrendering their old positions.—Preparations are now being made for the taking of the 1936 religious census. It will be remembered that the religious census is taken every ten years. It is thought that two years will be required to complete the task, one year for actual field work and one for the tabulation of the data that have been gathered. 250,000 questionnaires will be sent out.—A German mission-paper reports that the Minister of Education in Nanking,

China, has issued an order according to which religion is no longer to be kept out of Chinese schools. We have not heard as yet whether our own mission-schools in the places where they were closed have been affected by the position of the Nanking government.—The unification movement of the Methodists, which endeavors to unite Northern Methodists, Southern Methodists, and the Methodist Protestant Church, struck a snag when the Eastern Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church recently voted against the plan looking to the uniting of the three bodies. It seems that the members of the Methodist Protestant Church are more conservative than many of the people in the Methodist Episcopal churches. However, ten conferences of the Methodist Protestant Church have approved the plan. The total number of conferences that must vote in favor of the plan if it is to be ratified by the Methodist Protestant Church is sixteen.—The Episcopal House of Bishops, which recently was in session, did not hesitate to reverse the action of one of its members, Bishop Wilson of Eau Claire, who had granted to a certain Dr. John William Torok the status of a bishop in the Episcopal Church. It was pointed out by them that, while this man claimed to have the title of bishop, no individual bishop possessed the power to give him the status of bishop in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.—Quite refreshing is an article in the *Living Church* of August 8 on the topic "The Atonement—a Dead Subject?" The writer quotes a certain dean who made this slighting remark: "I think we spend too much time on dead subjects. . . . I have heard of a seminary where a whole term—or was it a whole year?—was given to a course on the Atonement." The writer very well says: "If we are to be taught in seminary that the atonement is a dead subject and not the living, flaming, eternal fact it was to St. Paul or the burning reality it was to St. Francis, then perhaps we had better shut the seminaries."—Baltimore was given a thirty-foot statue of Martin Luther, unveiled October 31 by the daughter of the German ambassador Dr. Hans Luther. The statue is placed in Druid Hill Park and cost fifty thousand dollars. The donor is the late Arthur Wallenhorst, who as a watchmaker, goldsmith, and dealer in precious stones had become quite wealthy. One part of the base has the words "Ein' feste Burg," another, "The gift of a jeweler of Baltimore." The inscription in front is simply "Martin Luther." Pastor Evers of Baltimore describes the statue thus: "Martin Luther is shown stepping forward firmly and quickly, holding in his left hand the Book of books, his right hand raised in greeting and blessing."—The editor of the *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, Dr. Laible, recently celebrated his eightieth birthday. We see from the September 25 issue that Lutheran leaders sent him greetings and expressions of gratitude for his work.

A.

II. Ausland.

Die Stellung der Bekennenden Kirche verurteilt. In der Bekennenden Kirche haben sich Lutheraner, Reformierte und Unionsleute vereinigt. In der „Allgemeinen Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung“ findet sich ein Artikel, der hierüber ein scharfes Wort sagt. Wir zitieren einen Teil davon:

„Das Dasein und die Arbeit des Rates der Evangelisch-Lutherischen

Kirche Deutschlands stellt an die Bekennende Kirche mit Nachdruck die folgenden Fragen:

„1. Auf Grund welches Bekenntnisses bist du, Bekennende Kirche?“

„2. Beruht nicht die wahre kirchliche Einheit in der Einheit der kirchlichen Lehre?“

„3. Ist es nicht eine vom Bekenntnis gebotene und im Kirchenkampf bewährte Erkenntnis, daß eine bekenntnisgebundene Kirche eines bekenntnisgebundenen Kirchenregiments bedarf?“

„Denn zunächst steht fest:

„1. Die Bekennende Kirche hat kein Bekenntnis, es müßten denn die theologischen Erklärungen von Barmen und Dahlem und die schon während der Synode von einem Teil der Synodalen abgelehnte Erklärung von Bad Lönghausen als die noch bescheidenen Ansätze eines neuen Bekenntnisses gewertet werden. Was ist aber dann mit den Bekenntnissen der Reformation, die bekanntlich bekenntnisgebundene Kirchen verpflichten? Wie steht es mit der inneren Kontinuität der Bekenntnisse, wie mit ihrer Übereinstimmung mit den Zeugnissen von Barmen, Dahlem, Lönghausen?“

„2. Die Einheit der Bekennenden Kirche ist keine Einheit in der Lehre. Sie ist Einheit der Kampfgemeinschaft gegen einen gemeinsamen Feind, und sie ist Einheit in der Abwehr einer bestimmten Irrlehre. Wiewohl die Abwehr von Irrlehren immer in Position und Negation zu geschehen hat, begründet sie noch keine volle Kirchengemeinschaft; denn sie ist nur dort, wo die gesamte Lehre einmütig bekannt wird. Auch zwischen denen z. B., die eins sind in der Abwehr der arianischen Ketzerei und in dem Bekenntnis zur wahren Gottheit und Menschheit Christi, besteht keine volle oder überhaupt keine Kirchengemeinschaft.

„3. Die Bekennende Kirche entbehrt bis heute eines bekenntnisgebundenen Kirchenregiments, da sie es in einem beträchtlichen Teil ihres Gebiets unterlassen hat, trotz der sie bindenden Synodalbeschlüsse die Organe der Kirchenleitung ernstlich bekenntnismäßig zu gliedern. Es geht nicht an, diese Aufgabe hinauszuschieben, bis eine Bekenntnisunion da ist.“

Was der Schreiber hier mit Kirchenregiment meint, ist nicht recht klar. Wenn er die Einrichtung eines Kirchenregiments im gewöhnlichen Sinne des Wortes als von Gott geboten ansieht, so können wir nicht mit ihm stimmen. Sein Kampf gegen Duldung der Irrlehre ist lobenswert. A.

Theologie, Konfession, Glaube. Einen unter dies Thema gestellten Vortrag, gehalten von Landesbischof D. Wurm-Stuttgart auf der Deutschen Evangelischen Woche in Stuttgart, bietet die „A. E. Z.“ ihren Lesern dar. Der Vortrag zeigt überzeugend, wie sehr gegenwärtig in Deutschland die Bekenntnisfrage im Zentrum steht. (Man vergleiche die von Schlatter, Lütger und Strathmann verbreitete Broschüre „Müssen wir heute lutherisch oder reformiert sein?“) Er zeigt aber auch, daß trotz aller guten Erkenntnis in bezug auf das Bekenntnis und dessen hohe Bedeutung, man sich drüben nicht dazu ermutigen kann, gegen den anerkannten Irrtum Stellung zu nehmen, was nicht nur der christliche Glaube selbst, sondern auch schon die allgemein geltende Ehrlichkeit erfordert. So kann z. B. D. Wurm äußerst schön über die Bedeutung des lutherischen Bekenntnisses schreiben, er kann aber auch ebenso schnell wieder einlenken, wenn es an die praktische Ausföhrung des durch das Bekenntnis gegebenen Pflichterfordernisses geht. Wir

lassen einiges aus dem Vortrag, dem Leser zur Prüfung vorgelegt, folgen. D. Wurm schreibt: „Warum Konfession? Dem nicht im kirchlichen Leben Stehenden, mit der Art und Geschichte seiner Kirche nicht Vertrauten, erscheint die Konfession wie ein überbleibsel aus längst vergangener Zeit, wie jene Zollschranken, die so lange die deutschen Länder getrennt hatten. . . . Ehe man kurzweg urtheilt: Was unsere Vorfahren vor vierhundert Jahren bewogte, geht uns nichts mehr an“ oder: „Die Antworten, die man damals auf die Fragen nach Gott und dem Heil gab, können nicht mehr unsere Antworten sein“, muß man doch prüfen, ob die Fragen und ob die Antworten so überholt sind, wie man es sich und andern einzureden versucht. Darüber herrscht wohl Einigkeit, daß der Ausgangspunkt für Luthers Kampf um das Evangelium und um die Kirche nicht die Konfession im heutigen Sinn war. Er kämpfte nicht um eine neue, sondern um eine erneuerte Kirche. Er protestierte mit den Seinigen nicht gegen, sondern für die Kirche. Er wollte nicht spalten, sondern die Christenheit im wahren Glauben vereinigen. . . . Warum aber, wenn es um den Glauben ging, endete die ganze Bewegung in einer Konfession, in der Abgrenzung einer Bekenntnis-gemeinschaft? Das ist nur verständlich, wenn man die ganze Tiefe des Gegensatzes kennt, in dem sich Luther zur römischen Kirche infolge seiner an der Schrift geschärften Einsicht befand. Es ging ihm . . . im Grund nur um das eine, was er an der Kirche, ihren Lehren und ihrem Gottesdienst aussetzen hatte: daß sie nicht wirklich Gott die Ehre gab, daß sie Menschengebote und Gottesgebote nicht deutlich unterschied, daß sie menschliche Verdienste einschob, wo es rein um Gottes Gnade ging, daß ihr ihre Macht wichtiger war als die reine Heilsverkündigung und daß sie deshalb am Kreuz, das sie auf allen Wegen aufrichtete, tatsächlich vorüberging. . . . Nur wenn man sich das ganz klar macht, daß es in der Reformation nicht um diese oder jene Meinungsverschiedenheit ging, wie sie auch im Mittelalter immer wieder zwischen den verschiedenen Mönchsorden und ihren theologischen Schulen ausgefochten wurden, sondern um die ganz grundlegende, Herz und Gewissen aufwühlende Frage „Wie kann ich vor Gott bestehen, wie meines Heils theilhaftig werden? Lehrt uns die Kirche den wirklichen Gott und das wirkliche Heil, oder hat sie Menschengedanken an die Stelle von Gottes Wort gesetzt?“ versteht man die ungeheure Wucht dieses Angriffs, versteht man auch, daß er im Unterschied von allen früheren Oppositionsbewegungen in der Kirche Kirchenbildend, nicht bloß gruppenbildend gewirkt hat. Es galt, von der grundsätzlichen Erkenntnis heraus, daß die bisherige Kirche über Gott und das Heil falsch gelehrt hatte, die Verkündigung in Predigt, Unterricht und Seelsorge schriftgemäß umzugestalten. . . . Diese Professoren samt den Fürsten und Ratsherren, die zu ihnen standen, waren Konfessoren im umfassenden Sinn des Wortes; sie bekannten nicht bloß eine Überzeugung, sondern sie bekannten die ihnen aufgetragene Wahrheit und den Gott der Wahrheit.“

Aus diesem Milieu ist, wie D. Wurm ausführt, das lutherische Bekenntnis gegen den Romanismus hervorgegangen. Leider ist man später des Kampfes müde geworden. D. Wurm schreibt: „Man darf wohl sagen, daß unter dem Eindruck der furchtbaren Opfer, die die konfessionellen Kämpfe gekostet hatten, der Kampf um die Wahrheit in dem höchsten Sinn, wie ihn das Neue Testament und die Reformation meint, erlahmte. Wie am Ende

des Weltkriegs jener Pazifismus aufkam, der alles von der Gnade und dem guten Willen der Sieger erwartete, der keinen Einsatz mehr wagte, weil die Sinnlosigkeit eines Kampfes um Ehre und Recht eines Volkes erwiesen schien, so gibt es auch einen geistigen Pazifismus, einen grundsätzlichen Verzicht auf den Kampf um die Wahrheit, der mit dem Wort „Toleranz“ seine Müdigkeit und seine Angst bemäntelt. . . . Unter dem Zeichen dieses Pazifismus standen die Auseinandersetzungen der evangelischen Theologie im eigenen Lager und im Verhältnis zu den geistigen Vorgängen in Zeit und Welt bis vor kurzer Zeit.“ Dieser Kampf ist nach D. Wurm wieder aufzunehmen gegen die reformierte Kirche. Er schreibt: „Wenn auch der Lehrunterschied zwischen lutherischer und reformierter Kirche sehr viel kleiner ist als der zwischen der römischen und der evangelischen Kirche, so ist doch auch hier die Wahrheitsfrage aufgeworfen, und es geht nicht an, sie zu ignorieren.“ Leider aber gibt Wurm hier keinen weiteren klaren Posaumenton, sondern zeigt eher, wie etwa bei aller Dissonanz der Lehre zwischen lutherischen und reformierten eine gegenseitige Achtung zwischen beiden bewahrt werden könne. Und darin liegt Wurms Schwäche. Er selbst schreibt: „Als mir Prof. Strathmann die Broschüre schickte „Müssen wir heute lutherisch oder reformiert sein?“ schrieb ich ihm postwendend zurück: „Nein, wir müssen es nicht sein, aber wir dürfen es denen, die es nach ihrer kirchlichen und persönlichen Führung sein müssen, nicht verwehren, es zu sein, und wir dürfen ihnen daraus keinen Vorwurf machen, als stellten sie die Konfession über die Schrift.““ Daß eine solche Stellung von Ja und Nein, Kampf und Nichtkampf nur Wirrwarr verursachen muß, zeigt die Geschichte. Die deutschen Theologen positiver Richtung befinden sich allerdings in einer merkwürdigen Stellung: sie wollen das Bekenntnis und wollen es auch nicht, Kampf und auch Frieden. So sehr hat sich der Krebsbisse des Unionismus bei ihnen festgefressen. Aber auch noch etwas anderes. Wie man in der Frage zum Bekenntnis hin und her schwankt, so auch in der Frage zur Schrift.

Wir schließen, indem wir das folgende theologische Kuriosum aus D. Wurms Feder unsern Lesern unterbreiten: „Eine mit den Mitteln der Logik gewonnene Sicherung war z. B. die altorthodoxe Verbalinspirationslehre. Gerade an ihrer verhängnisvollen Wirkung, an dem Zerstörungsprozeß, der mit durch sie eingeleitet wurde, sieht man, wie wenig sich die Kirche auf menschliche Sicherungen, seien sie dogmatischer, seien sie rechtlicher Art, verlassen kann.“ Wir fragen uns: Warum dieser Hieb auf die Verbalinspiration in einem Artikel, wo es doch darauf ankommt, daß der Respekt vor der Schriftwahrheit gehoben werden soll? Und welche „verhängnisvolle Wirkung“, welcher „Zerstörungsprozeß“ ist wohl in der Geschichte der Kirche durch die Schriftlehre von der Verbalinspiration eingeleitet worden? Hier träumt doch wohl D. Wurm, und zwar sind es Fleischesträume, die er hat.

J. T. M.

Wahl des ersten deutschen methodistischen Bischofs. Bisher stand die Bischöfliche Methodistenkirche in Deutschland unter Bischof D. Rüfen, der zu Genf in der Schweiz seinen Bischofsitz hat. Nun aber hat sich die Arbeit der Methodisten in Deutschland so erweitert, daß im September dieses Jahres Deutschland in der Person Dr. F. H. Melles von Frankfurt am Main seinen eigenen Bischof erhalten hat. Die Mitteilung findet sich in der „M. E. L. A.“ (Jahrg. 69, Nr. 40), die darüber berichtet: „Die Zentralkonferenz der

Bischöflichen Methodistenkirche, die vom 16. bis zum 20. September in Frankfurt am Main tagte und aus kirchenordnungsmäßig bestellten Vertretern aller deutschen Gemeindeverbände zusammengesetzt war, hat Dr. F. G. Otto Melle (geboren 1875 in Thüringen), den bisherigen Direktor des Predigerseminars der Methodistenkirche in Frankfurt am Main, zum Bischof berufen. Die Verhandlungen wurden von Bischof D. Nüßlen geleitet, der in Verbindung mit Bischof Wade, Stockholm, Alt-Präsident D. Kofthouse von der Methodistenkirche in England und einigen deutschen Distriktsuperintendenten die Weihe und Amtseinführung des neuen Bischofs vollzog. Die Gemeinden der Methodistenkirche in Deutschland sind damit von dem Mitteleuropäischen Sprengel abgetrennt und in einen deutschen Sprengel zusammengefaßt worden, dessen Leitung und Beaufsichtigung nun in den Händen Bischof Dr. Melles mit dem Wohnsitz in Berlin liegt. Ihm ist ein Kirchenvorstand zur Seite gestellt worden. Die neue Regelung ist mit Zustimmung des Reichskirchenministeriums erfolgt. Dem Werk der Methodistenkirche in Österreich, Ungarn, Bulgarien, Jugoslawien, Italien und der Schweiz steht Bischof D. Nüßlen, der zugleich das Seniorat im Bischofskollegium der Bischöflichen Methodistenkirche innehat, mit dem Sitz in Genf, 1 Rue des Photographes, auch weiterhin vor. An die Stelle des aus seinem Amt als Direktor des Predigerseminars der Methodistenkirche in Frankfurt am Main scheidenden Dr. F. G. Otto Melle ist der bisherige Dozent am Predigerseminar, Superintendent Dr. J. W. Ernst Sommer, M. A., als Direktor berufen worden."

Nachdem der Methodismus in Deutschland früher seitens der Regierung manche Opposition hat erfahren müssen, ist er nun vom Reichskirchenministerium als ganz und gar evangelisch und somit auch als kirchenexistenzberechtigt anerkannt worden. Der reformierte Einschlag wie auch der Unionismus dieser Kirchengemeinschaft hat ihr dabei gute Dienste geleistet.

J. T. M.

„Brüder“, aber doch keine Union! Auf der Genfer Calvinfeier lehnte der bayerische Bischof D. Meiser eine äußerliche Union mit den Reformierten ab, begrüßte sie aber dennoch als Brüder. Eine sehr feine Kritik solcher Stellung, wie sie Meiser eingenommen hat, gibt Rektor D. Willkomm in der „Freikirche“, und seinem Urteil muß jeder bekennnistreue Lutheraner ganz und gar beistimmen. Wir lesen:

„Bei einer Calvinfeier in Genf hat Landesbischof Meiser von Bayern eine Rede gehalten, die großes Aufsehen erregt hat und auf die auch wir, will's Gott, noch zurückkommen werden. Mangel an Zeit und Raum nötigen uns, heute nur ganz kurz folgendes zu sagen: Landesbischof Meiser lehnt eine Union mit der reformierten Kirche ab. Trotzdem nennt er — und er redet im Namen und als Vertreter „der lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands“ — die Reformierten „Brüder“ und sagt, die Lutheraner in Deutschland hätten gewußt, was sie taten, wenn sie in den hinter uns liegenden Jahren des Kampfes und der Not so oft mit den reformierten Brüdern den Brudernamen getauscht hätten! Damit haben diese Lutheraner gerade das Gegenteil von dem getan, was Luther in Marburg, auf den sie sich doch berufen und den sie wegen seines Verhaltens dort loben, getan hat. Luther hat damals, am 12. Oktober 1529, an Joh. Agricola in Saalfeld geschrieben: „Schließlich baten sie, daß wir sie wenigstens als Brüder anerkennen

folkten, und der Fürst [Philipp von Hessen] drang sehr darauf; aber es konnte ihnen nicht zugestanden werden.' Und vor seiner Wittenberger Gemeinde berichtete er auf der Kanzel u. a.: „... Denn wir haben Gottes Wort und den Text für uns, den sie nicht haben. Darum steht die Sache in einer guten Hoffnung. Ich sage nicht, daß eine brüderliche Einigkeit sei, sondern eine gütige, freundliche Eintracht, daß sie freundlich bei uns suchen, was ihnen fehlt, und wir wieder ihnen dienen. Wo ihr nun werdet fleißig bitten, wird sie auch brüderlich*) werden.' (Walch 2 3, 321.) Und Luther wußte wohl, was er tat und sagte. Ihm war gerade in Marburg ganz deutlich geworden, daß die Reformierten nicht die Heilige Schrift allein als Glaubensnorm annahmen, sondern in Glaubenssachen die Vernunft dreinreden ließen. Und so ist's doch heute noch. Es ist nicht wahr, daß die reformierte Kirche ebenso wie die lutherische „eine Kirche des Wortes“ wäre, wie jetzt von führenden Lutheranern in Deutschland immer wieder öffentlich behauptet wird. Diese Beurteilung der reformierten Kirche hat aber ihren Grund darin, daß diese „Lutheraner“ selbst nicht mehr wie Luther auf dem unfehlbaren Wort der Schrift stehen. Wäre die reformierte Kirche wirklich eine „Kirche des Wortes“, dann wäre auch kein Grund vorhanden, die Union mit ihr abzulehnen und den Reformierten die Bruderhand zu verweigern. Es ist aber leider so, daß nicht, wie Luther es damals hoffte, die Reformierten von den Lutheranern gelernt haben, sondern vielmehr umgekehrt: der reformierte Geist ist in die lutherische Christenheit Deutschlands eingedrungen und hat ihre Stellung zur Schrift und zu den aus der Schrift geschöpften Bekenntnissen erweicht und so dem Geiste der Union Tor und Tür geöffnet. Das „Luthertum“ Deutschlands ist in seinen führenden Männern von dem Grundsatz der Reformation Luthers, „Die Schrift allein“ — abgefallen. Bei solcher Stellung ist der Kampf gegen die Union von vornherein verloren, ja ist eitel Spiegelfechtere. Und es wundert uns, daß selbst das Breslauer „Kirchenblatt“ das nicht sieht und von der Rede Meisers in Genf urteilen kann, sie sei „ebenso bekenntnistreu als friedliebend“ gewesen! Auch wir wünschen von Herzen mit Luther, daß es zum Frieden mit den Reformierten kommen möge; aber er kann nur kommen, wenn die Reformierten ihren Irrtum erkennen und die klare Schriftwahrheit annehmen. Die Wahrheit, daß es auch in der reformierten Kirche wahre Christen gibt, die um den Irrtum nicht wissen, leugnen auch wir nicht. Aber es dient zur Verwirrung der Gewissen, wenn man diese Wahrheit in diesem Zusammenhang vorbringt. Mit demselben Recht könnte man dann auch von der römisch-katholischen Kirche als einer „Schwesterkirche“ reden und ihr die Bruderhand reichen; denn auch dort sind Christen. — Bei den strengen Reformierten hat übrigens Meiser wenig Gegenliebe gefunden. Sie beschuldigen ihn trotz der dargebotenen „Bruderhand“ des „lutherischen Konfessionalismus“ und fragen, was dieser eigentlich wolle. So geht's den „Brüdenbauern“ auf kirchlichem Gebiet!“

J. L. M.

*) Sperrsatz von mir. — M. B.

Book Review. — Literatur.

Paul's Secret of Power. By *Rollin H. Walker*. The Abingdon Press, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 181 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00. Order through Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Dr. Walker is professor of the English Bible at Ohio Wesleyan University, and as one would expect, the studies here submitted testify to his extensive and intensive occupation with the Holy Scriptures. The results of his researches and meditations he succeeds in setting forth in gripping language. The book is not intended to be a life of St. Paul, but endeavors to uncover the fountains of the amazing power of the apostle and his message. Some of the headings of the twelve chapters should be mentioned here to show the reader what aspects of Paul's work the author has in mind: "Utilizing the Advantages of a Providential Background"; "Power through Responding to the Divine Revelation"; "Power through a Great Conception of Christ"; "Power through Freedom from Legalism"; "Power from Crucifying Self"; "The Dynamic of a Great Hope." Sets of questions for study and discussion, one set for each chapter, conclude the volume. The various chapters are conveniently subdivided, and the resulting sections are given headings of their own. In endeavoring to evaluate the fascinating book theologically, I was struck by the author's vigorous rejection of the fallacy of autosoterism, and I cannot forbear quoting a few striking sentences (p. 26): "It is only after men have been lamed like Jacob in their ineffectual wrestling with the Angel of the Lord that they are capable of receiving His blessing. In the Epistle to the Romans (1—3) Paul declares that this failure of mankind to save themselves by the methods which they have so carefully worked out is a universal experience. Both Jews and Greeks, in spite of all their religious performances, he says, are under sin. Man's self-evident attempt to climb up to heaven on a ladder of his own making has been a failure." That is a doctrine which our haughty age, proud of its scientific achievements, stands much in need of. As I read the chapter dealing with the meaning of Christ and His work, I could not suppress the wish that the doctrine of the deity of our Lord and that of His vicarious atonement had been set forth with more triumphant clarity. Here and there I found a statement which evoked my unqualified dissent; for instance, p. 43, where the author says, in meeting the objection that some modern inquirer may not be able to accept the high doctrine concerning Christ which Paul teaches: "The answer is very simple. No one is required to work himself up to a theological position that has no relation to his experience." Christ is what He is, and we have no right to take away, or permit somebody else to take away, one little ray from the glory which is His divine possession. The polemic against insistence on adherence to a comprehensive creed (p. 62) is another such passage. Though the book, then, cannot receive the full endorsement of a conservative Lutheran, it abounds in green oases where cooling springs are bubbling and pleasant shade refreshes the weary traveler.

W. ARNDT.

Glaubenslehre für Gebildete. Von D. Erich Schäder, Professor der Theologie und Geheimer Konfistorialrat in Breslau. Verlag von C. Wertschmann in Gütersloh. 1933. 232 Seiten 6×8½. Preis: Kartontiert, M. 6.50; gebunden, M. 8.

Wie viele Heilswahrheiten darf ein Theolog leugnen, ehe ihm das Prädikat „positiv“ abgesprochen wird? Man ist da in Europa sehr liberal. Schäder wird unter die positiven Theologen gerechnet. Er verwirft aber die Inspiration und alleinige Autorität der Heiligen Schrift. „Von dieser gehen höchst verwunderliche Begriffe in den Köpfen hochgebildeter Menschen um.“ Ihnen „erscheint die Bibel immer noch als geheiligter Kodex“, „Produkt des übernatürlichen Gottesgeistes“. „Sie halten deshalb jenen äußerlichen, katholisierenden Glauben an die Schrift als inspiriertes Ganzes für die ihr angemessene Position.“ (S. 18 f.) Der christliche Glaube ist nicht „Bejahung religiöser Wahrheiten oder Lehren auf die äußere Autorität . . . der Heiligen Schrift hin“. (S. 38. 74.) Trotz dieser Stellung wird Schäder gar den „Bibeltheologen“ zugezählt. (Vgl. z. B. F. Rattenbusch, Die deutsche evangelische Theologie usw., S. 68.) Diese Stellung gilt eben als die positive, und darauf beruft sich Schäder. „Es gilt von der gesamten offenbarungsgläubigen Theologie des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts, die auf den Charakter wissenschaftlicher, das heißt, sachgemäßer, Forschung das nötige Gewicht legt“, daß „sie den Gedanken der sogenannten Verbalinspiration der neu- und alttestamentlichen Bücher abgestoßen hat.“ (S. 18.) Freilich behauptet Schäder durchweg, daß er „Worttheologie“ treibe. Und dieses Wort Gottes findet sich in der Heiligen Schrift. Aber nicht alles, was in der Heiligen Schrift geschrieben steht, ist Gottes Wort. Und was davon Gottes Wort ist, ist ursprünglich Menschentwort; aber es wird für uns Gottes Wort „so, daß Gottes machtvoller, persönlicher Geist oder sein Machtwille sich mit jenem Wort vergangener Menschen verbindet und durch daselbe an uns wirkt“. (S. 65.) „Der heilige Geist ist es, der das Menschentwort des Evangeliums zum Worte Gottes an uns macht.“ (S. 30.) Und wer sagt uns, welche Stücke der Heiligen Schrift nicht Gottes Wort sind (das heißt wohl, nicht solche Stücke, mit denen Gottes Machtwille sich verbinden kann)? Das muß uns unser Glaube sagen. „Der Glaube hat die Fähigkeit und die Aufgabe, den Kodex der Bücher des Neuen und Alten Testaments daraufhin zu beurteilen, ob und wiefern er Gottes Wort enthält.“ (S. 74.) Der Glaube wird uns z. B. sagen, „was sich etwa in den einzelnen Büchern des Alten Testaments an judaisierenden Bestandteilen zeigt“. (S. 73.) Der Glaube im Christen ist darum die eigentliche Quelle der Lehre und die eigentliche Autorität. Es heißt da z. B.: „Lassen wir jetzt den Glauben zum Ausdruck kommen.“ (S. 182.) „Vom lebendig-wirksamen Wort“ (das den Glauben schafft) „schließt der Glaube direkt auf die Welt“ (S. 104) und kommt so zur Lehre von der Schöpfung. (Wie er dabei zu dem Satz kommt: „Gottes Schaffen ist ewig, aber das Produkt seines Schaffens, die Welt, ist zeitlich“, ist nicht ersichtlich.) „Alles, was in der Glaubenslehre über den Glauben gesagt wird, ist schließlich Selbstausgabe des Glaubens.“ (S. 69.) „Eine Konsequenz aus den Grundpositionen des christlichen Glaubens ist diese Lehre nicht.“ (S. 232.) Schließlich: „Der Glaube hat in der Jesusfrage das letzte Wort.“ (S. 182.)

Welche christologischen Wahrheiten darf der positive Theolog verwerfen? Schäder verwirft „die Lehre des Athanasius von der vollen Teilhaberschaft Jesu Christi an dem Wesen Gottes“ (Homousie, S. 164). Er ist ausgesprochenenmaßen Subordinatianer. „Die Unterordnung Jesu unter Gott gehört, weil sie ihm

als dem Sohn Gottes eignet, zu seiner Gottheit. . . . Diese am Bibelwort erwachsene Erkenntnis der neueren Theologie ist unter den Gebildeten weit-
hin unbekannt. Sie wissen nur von der kirchlichen Lehre der Gottheit und der
reinen Gleichstellung Jesu Christi mit Gott." (S. 26.) Sie müssen sich an den
Gedanken „der Unterstellung des Sohnes unter den Vater-Gott" gewöhnen.
(S. 180.) Die Athanasianer lehren: „Jesus hat die göttliche Natur." Aber
„im Neuen Testament heißt es das nicht einfach". (S. 165) Schäfer sagt aller-
dings öfters: „Jesus ist Gott", aber er sagt lieber: „Jesus ist gottheitlich."
Und worin besteht diese Gottheitlichkeit Jesu, „diese eigentümliche Art der Gott-
heit Jesu" (S. 170)? Die Schrift „stellt Jesus als den sündenvergebenden
machtvollen Träger seines Geistes Gott an die Seite". (S. 179.) „Jesus Gott-
heit besteht in der persönlichen Teilhaberschaft an Gottes Geist." (S. 208.) Was
sagt Schäfer zu der Zweinaturenlehre? Dies: „Wie soll aus der Vereinigung
beider Naturen eine Person, ein Ich werden? Das kirchliche Dogma nimmt an,
daß das menschliche Ich bei dieser Verbindung sozusagen ausgeschaltet wird." (?)
„Daß Gottheitliche an oder in Jesus soll die personbildende Größe sein. Aber ist
Jesus dann noch der Gott m e n s c h?" (S. 165.) übrigen, redet hier der
G l a u b e, „der in der Jesusfrage das letzte Wort hat", oder die Vernunft?
Ist Jesus von der Jungfrau Maria geboren? „Der dogmatischen Annahme
gerade der jungfräulichen Geburt stehen eine Reihe literarischer Bedenken gegen-
über, so dies, daß außer Markus auch Johannes und Paulus nicht von ihr reden.
Der Glaube, der entscheidend an dem geschichtlich-wirkamen, gekreuzigten und
auferstandenen Herrn hängt, hat ein unbedingtes Interesse an dem Zeugnis von
der Herkunft Jesu aus Gottes neuschöpferischem, wunderbarem Wirken, aber
nicht an dem Besonderen der Herkunft von der Jungfrau Maria." (S. 181.)
Konnte Jesus sich irren? Jesus hat sich in seiner Lehre von der Existenz
Satan's nicht geirrt. Das darf man nicht annehmen. Aber „ein Irrtum Jesu
in irgendeiner literarischen, historischen oder lokalen Angabe bedeutet für den
Glauben an ihn, für die durch Gottes Geist vermittelte Glaubensautorität des
Herrn, nichts". (S. 153.) — Worin unterscheidet sich eigentlich die positive von
der liberalen Theologie? D. William Sunday sagt: "Christology is the strongest
dividing-line between the modern positive school in Germany and the libe-
ral." (See *Champion, Personality and the Trinity*, p. 83.) Der Liberale
behandelt Jesus als einen bloßen Menschen; der Positive lehrt noch irgendwie
seine Gottheit. Hier in Amerika, in lutherischen und reformierten Kreisen, würde
ein Theolog, der von der Gottheit Jesu redet wie Schäfer, jedenfalls den libera-
len, modernistischen Theologen zugezählt werden.

Schließlich, muß ein positiver Theolog die stellvertretende Genugtuung lehren?
Nicht mehr seit den Tagen Hofmann's. Schäfer lehrt: „Die altprotestantische
Theologie hat das Sterben Jesu Christi in folgender Weise gedeutet. Es voll-
zieht sich hier eine stellvertretende Genugtuung an die Heiligkeit und Gerechtigkeit
Gottes. . . . Diese Anschauung ist dem biblischen Evangelium oder dem Worte
Gottes und mit ihm dem Glauben fremd. Das gilt nun aber vollends, wenn
diese Auffassung des Kreuzestodes eine vulgäre Form annimmt, in der sie auch
unter den Gebildeten umgeht. . . . Man stellt sich nämlich den Sachverhalt so vor,
daß Jesus Christus durch sein stellvertretendes Strafleiden Gott vom Zorn zur
Gnade umgestimmt habe." (S. 24 f.) Was lehrt nun Schäfer? Er redet von
Stellvertretung, von einer „eigenartigen Stellvertretung". (S. 196.) Er denkt
sich die Sache so: „In Christus lebte während seiner geschichtlichen Wirksamkeit

die Gnade Gottes mit ihrer weltüberwindenden Macht. Aus der Vollmacht heraus, die hierin beschlossen lag, hat Jesus bei Lebzeiten Sünden vergeben. . . . Seine Vergebung bedeutet, daß er als der Versöhner, in der Fülle heiliger Liebe, zu uns kommt, unser Inwendiges erfasst und im Glauben schöpferisch erneuert. . . . Für den Herrn bedeutete seine vergebende Tätigkeit immer ein Leiden. Er gab sich keinem Gliede seines Volkes vergebend hin, ohne irgendwie, abgestuft, unter Irrtum, Verlehnung, Kleinglauben, Sorgenfönn, Bosheit zu leiden. . . . Der Herr hat auch im Sterben Vergebung gelübt. . . . Nun ist das Leiden, welches die Sünde dem Herrn antut, auf seiner Höhe. Die Gnade Jesu Christi entfaltet also hier die ganze Energie von Geduld und Treue. . . . Im Sterben vollendet sich die Gerechtigkeit Jesu. Er tut im Gehorsam gegen Gott das Äußerste. Deshalb hat er auch hier, der vollendeten Sünde gegenüber, die Vollmacht, Gnade zu üben." (S. 190 ff.) Klar ist die Sache nicht. Und wenn man den ganzen Abschnitt, S. 189—197, im Zusammenhang liest — und zehnmal genau liest —, die Sache wird nicht klar. Was Schäder nicht annehmen kann, das kann er klar sagen: „Zunächst kann keine Rede davon sein, daß Gott Jesus selber im Tode richtet. . . . Dies ist eine absolut unmögliche Vorstellung. . . . Gott hat den, der von keiner Sünde wußte, zur Sünde gemacht, aber nicht zum Sünder, nicht zum Schuldigen, den persönlich Verwerfung trifft." (S. 195.) — Wie gestaltet sich demnach Schäders Rechtfertigungslehre? Was meint er, wenn er sagt, daß die Vergebung bedeutet, daß der Versöhner uns im Glauben schöpferisch erneuert? Bischof D. Jänker, der ihm nicht abhold ist, stellt die Sache so dar: „Für Schäder ist, der tragende, letzte Sinn der Rechtfertigungslehre gar nicht der, daß dem Sünder die Entlastung von der Schuld oder die Seligkeit des verööhnten Gewissens zuteil wird. Er liegt darin, daß der Mensch der sündigen Ferne von Gott unter die Leitung des heiligen Gottesgeistes tritt oder den Geist Gottes empfängt. . . . Rechtfertigung ist diejenige Wirkung Gottes, durch welche er den Sünder mit sich in Gemeinschaft versetzt." (Das Wort Gottes, G. Schäder, S. 79.) Den Streit um den Unterschied zwischen Gerechtfertigung und Rechtfertigung hält Schäder für einen Schulstreit, der endlich aufhören müsse." (Allg. Ev.-Luth. K. Z., 11. Oktober 1935.)

Das Schlußwort Jänklers möge hier noch Platz finden: „Es ist nicht zu verwundern, daß Schäder bei seiner grundsätzlich theozentrischen Einstellung von der neuen Welle, die durch die dialektische Theologie heraufbeschworen wurde, ganz besonders stark berührt worden ist und daß umgekehrt die dialektische Theologie manches an Schäders Theologie als Falschheit empfindet." L. h. Engel der.

God in Action. By Karl Barth. Translated by Elmer G. Homrighausen and Karl J. Ernst. Round Table Press, Inc., New York. 143 pages, 5½×8, including an appendix of oral expositions made by Barth. Price, \$1.75.

All students of theology interested in the Dialectical Theology will be grateful to the translators and publishers of the five addresses by Karl Barth contained in this handsome, handy volume. Barth is still the chief exponent of the Theology of Crisis, and no matter what assenting or dissenting pupils of his may write, the theological world still desires to hear what Barth himself has to say in exposition of his theology. The addresses, here offered to English and American students of German theology in a good translation, were originally delivered in German or French before

pastoral conferences in various parts of Switzerland and represent Barth's specific teachings on Revelation, the Church, Theology, the Ministry, and the Witness Function of the Believer in the World. Barth here speaks a little more clearly than he does in his more learned works; yet his usual obscurity of diction and style crops out even in these popular talks and often leaves the reader at a loss to understand what he really means to say. Barthianism arose as a revolt against the pantheism, Pelagianism, naturalism, rationalism, and secularism of his time, urging a speedy and absolute return to the Reformation. But what Barth has proclaimed was neither genuinely Lutheran nor strictly Reformed, but a sort of religious philosophy built around the central thought of God's sovereignty and man's absolute dependence upon Him in the realm of nature and grace. Though both thoughts are Biblical if properly understood and interpreted, Barth, in his new religious system, has become a rationalist himself, unable to direct his students rightly according to the divine truth. Throughout the five addresses offered in this book the reader will find truly Biblical statements, especially in the one entitled "The Ministry of the Word." But there are also many more statements in which the traditional Christian faith is disavowed; and there are still more in which the presentation of ideas is so vague and obscure that the reader fails altogether to understand what is meant. Just to mention a few instances. Barth speaks of *revelation* as *being God Himself* (p. 15: "Revelation is God Himself"). Then again he speaks of revelation as being an act of forgiveness or even an act of sanctification (p. 18). Or he speaks of the Holy Scriptures as being the true authority in religion, since in them God Himself speaks. Yet according to Barth not the Bible is the Word of God, but that which is revealed to him who studies the Bible. He writes: "The Scriptures govern the Church and not the Church the Scriptures" (p. 30). He adds, however: "But note well, the Scriptures as a tool in God's hands; for they are only human testimony of divine revelation" (*ibid.*). Barth thus makes the Bible a human book and so advances no higher in his bibliological belief than did the destructive critics and other heretics whose unbelief he so stoutly condemns. After all, he is only another *Schwaermer*, and one who is all the more dangerous for the very reason that he pretends to be loyal to the traditional faith. Of the *Church*, Barth teaches that it exists wherever the Scriptures speak and where man hears God (p. 29). But he makes no distinction between the Law and the Gospel, and nowhere does he describe the members of the Church as believers in Christ, as did Luther. Of *Theology* he says: "Theology's essential hypothesis, or axiom, is revelation, which is God's own act, done in His Word and through His Word" (p. 41). However, a few pages later he declares: "Theology is a human and not a divine work. Theology is service to the Word and is not itself the Word of God" (p. 49). Is theology, then, human revelation by which the Word of God is revealed? Why does Barth not speak more clearly? Already in America great praise has been bestowed upon Barth and his school, but every one who is fully truthful must contend that he is both a *Schwaermer* and a *Schwaetzer*. As *Schwaermer* he separates authority in religion from the Holy Scriptures and places it in subjective feeling. As *Schwaetzer* he speaks, not to instruct, but to obscure and

mystify. But even so, it is a truly laudable piece of work which the publishers of these addresses have done in making the false prophet Barth accessible to the study of English Bible scholars and so subject to critical examination in the light of Scripture and to just condemnation on the basis of the objective Word of God.

J. T. MUELLER.

Neue Texte zur Bibelverdeutschung des Mittelalters. Mit zwei Bildtafeln und einem Anhang: „Perikopenschlüssel für zehn Heiligenmessen in deutschen Quellen.“ Herausgegeben in Gemeinschaft mit Artur Thomas Hatto, Fritz Jülicher, Willy Lütke und Ludwig Wolff von Hans Vollmer. Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, Potsdam. 274 Seiten $6\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$. Preis: RM. 24.

Mit Freuden begrüßen wir diesen weiteren Band in dem großen Unternehmen der Herausgeber, die Geschichte und die Texte der vorlutherischen Übersetzungen der Bibel in die deutsche Sprache zu bieten. Die Hauptarbeit an diesem Bande hat auch in diesem Falle der Hauptredakteur getan; aber die Beiträge von Hatto, „Eine deutsche Apokalypse des 14. Jahrhunderts“, Wolff, „Die Reimbibel des Pfaffen Rönemann“, Jülicher, „Die Revision der Olmüger Handschrift“ und „Die Evangelien Wien und Hamburg“, und Lütke, „Perikopenschlüssel“, sind hervorragende Leistungen auf diesem Gebiete. Den Abschluß des ganzen Buches bilden sehr dankenswerte Register. Auch die beigegebenen Tafeln erhöhen den Wert des ganzen Bandes um ein bedeutendes. Nicht nur für den Theologen, sondern für jeden, dem die Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und der deutschen Kultur nicht gleichgültig ist, ist dieser Band sehr wertvoll.

P. C. KREHMANN.

Kagawa the Christian. By Jan Karel Van Baalen. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. 110 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. Price, 50 cts.

The Japanese evangelist Tojohiko Kagawa, who visited America early this year and spoke before thousands of people in many of our large cities, has become the storm-center of criticism, and the present book is one of the many biographies and descriptions of the man which attempt to awaken and maintain a sympathetic interest in this messenger from the Far East. The author of this book certainly makes every effort to present Kagawa in the most favorable light. But even he must make the concession "I am convinced that my former classmate and friend Kagawa has perhaps not fully escaped the influence of theological tendencies which run contrary to his fundamental convictions." (P. 36.) The many quotations from Kagawa's books which he offers bear this out. Time and again one is constrained to note on the margin: What does the man mean to say? Can this be considered adequate? etc. One is forced to the conclusions: Kagawa may in his own heart believe in the atonement wrought by the blood of Jesus Christ, but he is at best a poor theologian in expressing the Scripture doctrines clearly and adequately, and he lacks theological balance. As long as he has not fully grasped the truths of the Scripture, he should not presume to be a teacher of others. Even if he is not a Modernist, his language often smacks of modernistic tendencies. It is doubtful whether his teaching will really lead souls to Jesus, the Savior of sinners.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Portraits of Christ in the Gospel of John. By *Harold Samuel Laird*.

The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago. 126 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. Price, 75 cts.; paper covers, 20 cts.

This book makes acceptable reading. The brief meditations assert the doctrine of Christ's deity and of the vicarious atonement under such chapter heads as "The Son of God"; "The Son of Man"; "The Great Physician"; "The Bread of Life"; "The Light of the World"; "The Resurrection and the Life"; "The Humble Servant"; "The Sender of the Holy Spirit"; "The Uplifted Savior."

J. H. C. FRITZ.

The Art of Ministering to the Sick. By *Richard C. Cabot, M.D.*, and

Russell L. Dicks, B.D. The Macmillan Co., New York. VIII and 384 pages, $6 \times 8\frac{3}{4}$. Price, \$3.00. Order through Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The authors hope that this book "will be of interest to all who care for the sick: to doctors, nurses, social workers, and to the sick themselves, as well as the ministers, to whom it is addressed primarily." In our opinion the authors have succeeded in putting together a very valuable book, brimful of helpful information and practical suggestions as to the technique of ministering to the sick, and no pastor, inexperienced or experienced, can read the book without deriving real benefit, becoming better qualified to perform his duties as *Seelsorger*. We should like to call attention to a number of chapters which we have found especially helpful, though we cannot always agree with the position taken by the authors. Chapter II, "Special Advice on Work with the Sick," offers 24 specific and 10 general rules for the pastor's deportment in the sick-room. Two samples, taken at random, may be welcome to our readers. "Sympathy can be given in a way that does harm. The sufferer should be made to realize that you share his pain; but if you dwell on his feelings you can unman him." (P. 21.) "A Christian minister can never be insulted or more than momentarily irritated by the patient because he is a patient." (P. 26.) Simple rules, most of them, and most of them quite self-evident, yet so often forgotten. There is Chapter III, "Institutional Problems," devoted chiefly to the best manner of meeting the various complaints of patients against the doctors, the institution, the nurses, etc. Chapters of special value to the young pastor are IX and X, "*Vis mediatrix Dei*" and "Points on Common Diseases," the former presenting a picture "of what nature does to keep the body sound despite the strains which challenge its strength in health as well as in disease" (p. 119), while the latter briefly and accurately describes a number of diseases every pastor should recognize. Chapter XVIII, "Note-writing," to mention only one more, urges the pastor to write out extended notes on his experiences and impressions at every visit and offers an outline and an instructive illustration. On p. 260 we read: "Doubtless it will be said that the minister has no time to keep notes. That sounds familiar. Lazy doctors say the same thing, but competent doctors, no matter how busy, keep notes, because they know that they cannot otherwise do good work. Are ministers busier than doctors?"

The book unfortunately reflects the modernistic viewpoint time and again, which makes it necessary that the Lutheran, Scriptural, background be supplied by our readers. On p. 312, for instance, we read: "We have

made no reference to salvation in this chapter or in the former pages. Some will ask: 'Is it not the purpose of the clergy to work for the patient's salvation, especially at the time of death?' The conception of the ministry as a life of 'saving souls' by pulling them back from the brink before they plunge to their doom involves beliefs which we do not hold. At what point in a person's spiritual growth, salvation begins or at what point it is accomplished is beyond our power to estimate. Some will object to our conception of spiritual growth, perhaps will believe that we have fallen in with an easy, nineteenth-century optimism. But such is not the case. Our conception of growth, which encompasses our conception of salvation, leads us to place the individual as an individual at the center of the picture. It is the minister's task, we hold, to go to the sufferer and to minister to the sufferer's needs as he finds them and not as he assumes them to be." Under the heading "The Minister's Kit-bag" (p. 159) the author says: "The bag represents not only the continuity of the minister's relation to the invalids whom he visits, but the particular nature of his office. It should contain some Protestant equivalent for the Roman Catholic priest's stole, wafer, and oil. What these equivalents should be will differ with each minister. Some will want none at all because they carry in their minds all the insignia of their office. But whatever their spiritual principles, they will probably have some material representative, something to do for Protestants what the crucifix and the rosary do for Catholics." And he lists among the books that might be suggested for patients who ask for religious reading also the following: *Introduction to a Devout Life*, St. Francis de Sales; *The Manhood of the Master*; *The Meaning of Prayer*; *The Meaning of Faith*, all by Harry Emerson Fosdick (p. 168). In spite of this failing, a serious one, the book contains so much of valuable information and suggestion that we feel we are doing our pastors a real favor in calling their attention to this book.

T. LAETSCH.

Financial Recovery for the Local Church. By *Julius Earl Crawford*. Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn. 204 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00. Order through Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This book is written from the standpoint of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, a fact for which the Lutheran reader will occasionally have to make some allowances. On page 93, for instance, we would substitute the services of our synodical committee. With reference to a remark on page 99 we would affirm that we do not *solicit* financial assistance from non-members. But for all this, the book can easily be translated into terms of our own Synod, even if a Lutheran pastor will want to emphasize some things more and modify others. But, on the whole, we recommend this book most heartily, not only to pastors, but also to discriminating laymen of finance boards in our congregations. It is full of stimulating and challenging statements and splendid information concerning plans that have actually proved their value. Moreover, the book is written from an evangelical viewpoint. It correctly states that the program of church finance "involves a realization of the essential worth of the Church; a clear understanding of the Christian basis of church finance; a proper appreciation of the pastor's relation to the finances of his charge; the recognition and fulfilment of the laity in the temporal affairs of the

Church; adequate and equitable provision on the part of the local church for ministerial support, for building facilities and equipment, and for all connectional as well as local needs, necessitating the utmost care in budget planning; the best methods of cultivating the constituency, enlisting the constituents, conserving and carrying on; and a businesslike method of handling the funds." Among the many fine statements of the book are the following. The author quotes with approval: "The Old Testament affords no support for the theory sometimes advocated that tithing is to be the main support of the religion of the New Testament." His own statement, on page 36, reads: "A local church, to be Christian, cannot build its financial program upon legalism. The church that attempts it cannot produce character that is genuinely and thoroughly Christian. The divine ideal for the individual or the group cannot be realized through external coercion. It is possible only through the voluntary and enthusiastic loyalty which is the fruitage of Christian freedom." Again, on page 38: "In an age of democracy and liberty it [namely stewardship education] is an imperative factor in developing a sense of obligation in proportion to opportunity and of responsibility in keeping with privilege." But this will suffice to show the tenor of the book. We trust that many pastors will obtain copies of this book for themselves and their finance boards.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Proceedings of the Sixteenth Convention of the English District of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 96 pages, 6X9. Price, 22 cts.—**Central District.** 92 pages. Price, 24 cts.—**Eastern District.** 80 pages. Price, 21 cts.—**Sued-Wisconsin-Distrikt.** 71 pages. Price, 14 cts.—**Michigan District.** 96 pages. Price, 16 cts.

It is a pleasure to call attention to these synodical reports in the uniform format and print which has always characterized this branch of the work done by our Concordia Publishing House, and it is a pity that the plan which was brought to the attention of our clergy early in the summer, according to which the entire set of reports was to be issued in a uniform fashion, could not be carried out for want of cooperation. These reports constitute a valuable theological library and should be found in particular in the library of every young pastor of our Synod. In the five reports which are listed above we have the following doctrinal essays. The English District heard two essays: one on "Our English District in Its Early Developments," with valuable historical material; the other on "Spiritual Stewardship," presenting the topic from a most interesting angle. The Central District likewise heard two essays: one on the words of the Creed "I believe in the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting" and the other on "Christian Stewardship." The Eastern District heard an essay on "The Great Commission," which is full of material for mission talks. The South Wisconsin District heard two papers: one on "Church Discipline" and the other on "The Christian Home," both highly instructive and valuable. The Michigan District heard two English papers: one on "The Layman in Church-work" and the other on "Modernism and Redemption," both of which were exceedingly timely and practical. No pastor or layman will study the various essays here enumerated without the richest spiritual blessings.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

The Woman Pays. By Frank Leighton Wood, M. D. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Mich. 280 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8$. Price, \$2.15.

The three problems upon which this volume attempts to shed the light of medical experience are indicated by the following expansion of the title, *The Woman Pays*, printed on the jacket of the book: "For Sex Ignorance and Mistakes of Men and Women before and after Marriage the Bride Pays"; "For the Imbecility of Criminal Abortion and Ignorance of Birth Control the Wife Pays"; "For Medical Haste and Indifference and Surgical Greed in Childbirth the Mother Pays." The chapters of the book fulfil the promise given on the same jacket that Dr. Wood's pages are "entirely free of salacious terminology, while, at the same time, exhibiting a commendable freedom from furtive hint and half-explained suggestion, usual to most treatises of similar character." After general considerations of the sex question and a chapter devoted to physiology, he discusses venereal diseases and, in connection therewith, makes a plea for physical examination of all persons contemplating marriage. The discussion of birth control contains purely negative judgments regarding this practise, the single exception being made in favor of the observance of the cycle of fertility. The remaining chapters, 8 to 14, more than half of the book, contain a most valuable discussion of obstetrics. The author is very pronounced in his opinion that surgery in cases of childbirth is being greatly overdone; also that the family physician can be depended on in preference to hospitalization, which has a much higher mortality rate than deliveries in the home. While the book does not attempt to solve every moral problem connected with sex and married life, it is wholesome in its tone and bears the imprint of a scientific, yet kindly and sympathetic spirit.

TH. GRAEBNER.

Convention Year-Book. The Walther League. 61 pages. Price, 25 cts. Order from the Walther League, 6438 Eggleston Ave., Chicago, Ill.

This year-book and report on the Houston Convention is especially interesting on account of the Unite the Youth Endeavor resolutions, which all our pastors may well study at this time. P. E. KRETMANN.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us — one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Dec 36" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.

rand

ight
ittle,
ance
ride
irth
rical
ulfil
rely
om-
usual
of
real
ina-
rth
the
of
ok,
ro-
tly
nce
ries
ral
one
rit.

ts.
III.
lly
ch

ct.
la-
as
cal
en
ve
ite
r;
ib-
t)
or

on
as
on
se
ct